


Univ. of Ill. Library

51

4663



Digitized by the Internet Archive  
in 2016 with funding from  
University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign Alternates

7/6

97.153

10/1



THE RESTORATION OF PATHS TO  
DWELL IN

*"And they that shall be of thee shall build the old waste places: thou shalt raise up the foundations of many generations; and thou shalt be called, the repairer of the breach, the restorer of paths to dwell in."*—ISAIAH lviii. 12.

*"Vellem cum invidiâ nominis (Origenis) ejus habere etiam scientiam Scripturarum, flocci pendens imagines umbrasque larvarum, quarum natura esse dicitur terrere parvulos et in angulis garrere tenebrosis."*—HIERON. *in Gen. Proœm.*

*THE RESTORATION OF*  
PATHS TO DWELL IN

ESSAYS ON THE  
RE-EDITING AND INTERPRETATION OF THE  
OLD TESTAMENT SCRIPTURES

BY THE REV. BENJAMIN STREET, B.A.

VICAR OF BARNETBY-LE-WOLD

STRAHAN & CO.  
56 LUDGATE HILL, LONDON

1872

*[The Right of Translation is Reserved]*

LONDON :  
PRINTED BY VIRTUE AND CO.  
CITY ROAD.



## PREFACE.

---

**I**T is becoming daily more evident that the contention for the Truth is being transferred from the field of the New Testament to that of the Old.

The Church of England, at her reformation, took up new but well-defined positions on the Gospel ground, which have ever since been strengthened and made unassailable. These positions were selected wisely, because a wiser view and better knowledge of the New Testament had been attained.

It is high time that the Church should plainly declare what positions she takes up on the ground of the Old Testament; for this the Church has never yet done, but has sat still, allowing this individual commentator and that to declare what positions are tenable and necessary to be held; some of which are such that the faith and work committed to the

19 Jul. 99 Spec. vol. div.

Church are neither hindered nor promoted, whether those positions are abandoned or maintained.

Other positions of great importance the Church neither abandons nor firmly occupies. Some of these concern the precepts and exemplification of immutable morality; and the sceptics of the time, finding these carelessly held, select them as points of assault, and make havoc. The Church, indeed, too generally defends such positions on the Old Testament as the Jews selected for defence, and with the same weapons that the Rabbin used.

Our Lord and the Apostles did otherwise; they chose points of strength unsuspected by the Jews, as when our Lord defended the truth of the resurrection from the ground on which Moses stood when the Lord appeared to him at the bush; and, from that place, scattered the Sadducees, who rested the defence of their opinions on a place in Scripture ignorantly chosen by them.

Our Lord purified the Word of God from many false deductions, drawn from it by *those of old time*. It is highly probable that many received deductions and conclusions, drawn from the text of the Old Testament by theologians, and handed down from

one commentator to another, will appear erroneous if tested by the spirit which is promised to the Church whenever she desires to be guided into the truth.

Many things attributed to intentions on the part of the Lord, as the statute of divorce was by the law-men in our Lord's days, will, if tested by light from Christ, be seen to be attributed to man's infirmities. And so the things that belong to man will be rendered to man, and the things of God to God.

In this matter the Church has never discriminated for herself, but has listlessly adopted the decision formed by the Jews in assigning to the Lord or to man the responsibility for actions recorded. It is very possible that a revision of such points in Scripture would reverse the opinion of the men of old time in the Church.

It seems also most desirable that the Church would distinctly declare, not only the points which she insists on maintaining (this could be done without making them articles of creed), but also what points she has no concern in pronouncing on, as not of the deposit of truth committed to her.

If the Church had energy and courage to say, that

some questions, such as those concerning the number of hours in the days of creation, do not concern her, she would gain in strength by diminishing the area on which she is (supposed to be) assailable. And so with several other points.

Many of the difficulties which the Church finds in defending the Old Testament are attributable to the fact that hitherto she has been defending, not the original, but a Jewish translation of it, made in a very debased age of Jewish theology. For the English Old Testament is substantially and mentally the Septuagint; and the spirit of the original, clad in that version, is as the free woman Sarah disguised in the garments of the bond woman Hagar. The Word of God is as shackled and hampered by its diction and temper as David was in Saul's armour; and whilst so apparelled, the Old Testament will not triumph over the Philistine.

The writer of these essays has ventured to question the claims of the Septuagint, in many places, to be considered a true reflection of the original; and he has also suggested an inquiry as to whether the Hebrew text, as we have it, has preserved the true order of arrangement which it must have once ex-



hibited. He has considered that on such points the Church has never cared to pronounce, and that consequently they may be discussed without any breach of that loyalty which he owes to the Church.

As regards a remarshalling of the contents of some books of the Old Testament, advocated in the following essays. He has considered the Old Testament Scriptures as being the heirloom jewels of the Church, and that wisdom and propriety require her to dispose them so as best to adorn the Bride of Christ; and that it cannot be asserted, on any good grounds, that the arrangement of them which the Jewish Church made and used is most edifying for the use of the Church of Christ, or fittest for setting forth the doctrine of God her Saviour.

But though the author considers the contents of some books to be in a dislocated condition, he does not view them as compacted of fragments by different authors, and written at different times. And although he advocates the transposition of many passages, it is not his notions, but the requirements of consistency in fact and doctrine, which suggest its being done, so as to reproduce the original structure of the book.

He also protests against any comparison being drawn, by superficial readers, between the process of re-ordering the contents of a book of Scripture, which he advocates, and that *legerdemain* which Tertullian charges on Marcion and others, who constructed out of Scripture a patchwork text, utterly at variance with the original mind of the Scriptures, but compacted by them to support their own theories. A method of treating Scripture which he compares to a method applied by some unhappy writers to the writings of Virgil, such as Hosidius Geta, who concocted a tragedy, “*Medea*,” with verses picked out here and there from the *Æneid*. “*Vides hodie ex Virgilio fabulam in totum aliam componi, materiâ secundum versus, versibus secundum materiam concinnatis.*” *We have seen a story, totally different from that in Virgil, composed by picking out Virgil’s lines where they suited the subject in hand, and dovetailing passages so composed to construct the story required.*—(De Præs. Her., xxxix.)

Tertullian, indeed, with characteristic rashness, adds that a perplexing order in Scripture must have been providentially allowed so as to supply materials

to heretics, since we read, *there must needs also be heresies.*

Elsewhere, in a better mind, he accounts for the confused disposition and ambiguities in Scripture by concluding that they have been permitted to be as a test of tenacity in faith : “ Ut fides, non mediocri præmio destinata, difficultate constaret.”—Apol. xxi.

Perhaps the ancient Scriptures have been suffered to come into the hands of the Church obscure in expression and confused in arrangement, in many places, because the Church has the spirit that can guide her into the truth, if she will but stir it up and profit by it; and the first requisite for profiting by the help of the spirit is a conviction that things, when shown by the spirit, will be shown by a light which never shone on them before Christ came, and will probably fall into an order never before then discernible in them. Hitherto the Church has been satisfied to read the Old Testament by the taper of the Alexandrian translator.





## INDEX OF CONTENTS.

---

### I.

	PAGE
1. Hebrew written characters.—2. Collection and custody of sacred rolls.—3. Copyists . . . . .	1

### II.

1. Rehabilitation of the Hebrew Scriptures by Ezra.—2. Unconcern of the early Church for the Hebrew text when taking over the Old Testament.—3. The Old Testament came into the Church in the form of a Jewish Greek translation.—4. The order of the matter in some books dislocated.—5. Its reordering desirable . . . . .	22
--	----

### III.

1. Argument in favour of rearranging the book Exodus.—2. Evidence of disarrangement in it.—3. Its present order injurious to the right understanding of it.—4. No Levitical ordinances till Moses had made a second abode on Mount Sinai.—5. Plea for a better ordering of the book . . . . .	57
---	----

### IV.

1. The book Exodus probably transposed by the ancient Jews.—2. Their reasons for transposing its contents: Original order recoverable.—3. Its desirableness.—4. Confusing effect of its present arrangement . . . . .	84
---	----

## V.

1. Proposed revision of the authorised version.—2. Jewish interpretations not to be implicitly trusted.—3. Jewish misconceptions as to the visitation of a father's iniquity on his children.—4. Decadence and revival of the knowledge of Hebrew . . . . . 102

## VI.

## TRANSLATION AND INTERPRETATION.

1. Some causes of imperfections in the English authorised version.—2. When interpretation struggles with translation the context is the umpire.—3. National prejudices have swayed interpretation.—4. Corrupt theology has darkened it.—5. The two streams of prophecy in Isaiah . . . . 126

## VII.

1. Reason, Tradition, and the Spirit, as interpreters of Scripture.—2. Revealed and natural religion considered as judges of the truth.—3. Scripture appealing to the animal creation.—4. Behemoth and the beasts of the field . . . . . 151

## VIII.

1. The Lord names Himself. — 2. The words Elohim and Jehovah.—3. Scope of Scripture.—4. Creating, forming, making.—5. Other races besides the race from Paradise.—6. The Lord walking in the garden.—7. The Cherubim 174

## IX.

## THE INVASION OF CANAAN.

1. In what works the Lord employs the agency of man.—2. What works He reserves to Himself.—3. The agents which He appointed for the dispossession of the Canaanites.—4. How they were superseded.—5. Man in power goes beyond his commission.—6. Man interpreting adds bitterness to the record . . . . . 207

X.

1. Specialities of the Hebrew moral temperament.—2. The peculiar position and condition of the people in the wilderness.—3. Futility of the claim of the nation to military successes.—4. Commentators . . . . . 229

XI.

1. Hebrew texts examined.—2. *I will destroy all the people.*—3. *Thou shalt smite them and utterly destroy them.*—4. *Anathema.*—5. *Nor show mercy unto them.*—6. *I will cut them off* 246

XII.

1. No direct instructions to use violence given by the Lord to Joshua.—2. Formula peculiar to a direct divine communication.—3. Formula when the communication proceeded from a priest.—4. Means supplied to the priest for obtaining direction.—5. Urim and Thummim . . . . . 267

XIII.

1. The morality of the invasion of Canaan judged by its consequences.—2. Eclipse of the priest's office as the medium of divine direction.—3. The subsequent fortunes of the dispossessed nations . . . . . 287

XIV.

1. The Gentile Church.—2. A falling away in it analogous to that of the Israelites.—3. Influence of the delusions of the world on the Church.—4. Influence of the temper of the age on translators . . . . . 303

XV.

1. Relative places occupied by the ceremonial law, and by the Temple services in the Jewish life.—2. The usual conception of the Temple sacrifices is confused and exaggerated.—3. Elementary principles of worship by sacrifice.—4. Holocaust . . . . . 324

## XVI.

1. The Temple and the Church.—2. The sacrifice which Christ made.—3. His offering of it . . . . . 340

## XVII.

1. Sacrifice appealing to the Lord.—2. The memorial in the sacrifice.—3. The remembrance at the Eucharist.—4. The Passover household feast.—5. The Passover in the Temple.  
6. The preparation . . . . . 351

## XVIII.

1. Conventional and popular notions of the status of the Israelites.—2. Of the means of access of the Jew to the mind of the Lord.—3. The more sure access of the Christian . . . . . 372

## XIX.

1. Christ's promise of reply to prayer.—2. The name of the Lord.—3. His name proclaimed before the Commandments were published . . . . . 388

## XX.

- The understanding mind and the believing spirit . . . . . 406



## I.

- 3  
1. Hebrew written characters.—2. Collection and custody of sacred rolls.—3. Copyists.

1. THE form of the earliest written letters which we can ascertain to have been used by the people of whom were the writers of the Hebrew Scriptures indicates the valley of the Euphrates as the most probable locality from which the ancestor of that people came; the character of writing now called Samaritan being taken as the nearest known approach to the ancient writing of the Israelites, and as having features indicating the first use of marks by which a fact was conveyed by a type to the eye.

It is not improbable that the first marks impressed on objects would be made by the weapon of the man who, having won them with it, desired to stamp them as his property; and that the marks would be made with no more idea of expressing speech by

symbols than the early creature had which impressed, and left impressed, on the then soft surface on which it trod, the imprints of its feet, which, on the now hardened surface, record sufficient to inform the naturalist of the habits and form of the creature which left those traces of its path.

The man who impressed the head of the arrow of his bow—and he may have been Nimrod the mighty hunter—no more thought of originating written speech than the man who first sent the electric spark through a wire conceived of originating the electric telegraph.

We are not at present concerned with the centres and origin of written language in all parts of the world—there may have been several and separate germs in various places—but with the origin of the writing used among a people who won possessions by the sword and the bow (Gen. xlviii. 22), and whose ancestor is traceable to the plains near the Euphrates.

The plastic clays of the Euphratean valley still show how they received and have retained impressions that are records, and still speak.

The warrior, when war became a pursuit, might

choose his sword out of which to fashion a tool with which to inscribe his right to conquered land upon the face of their rocks. The shepherd class, to which Abraham belonged, would retain the bow for use; the flint head of whose arrow would require softer substances on which to leave its impress. The arrow-headed character would abide, and acquire gradual modifications among such people. Inter-course with Egypt would introduce them to the papyrus as a material, and to the reed as an instrument; writing would then be either by characters pierced through the leaf, or made to appear on its surface by means of ink. The character would thus gradually become invested with the features due to delineation, not impression, and to the pliable powers of the penman's hand; and the original separate arrow-head marks would coalesce into forms closely resembling those of the Samaritan alphabet, the earliest type of Hebrew writing that survives.

When the Jews, long after, were carried away captive to the Euphrates, they found at Babylon the character called the nail-headed character, a bastard arrow-headed letter, in use; and the Jews born during the captivity, and educated in Babylonia,

learned the square-faced character of writing, popularly called the Hebrew, itself formed by the adhesion of several separate marks into one formal character; and on their return brought it back with them, and it was used in copying the Scriptures as being the only mode of writing known to the people.

But the Jews who had not been involved in the abduction of their countrymen to Babylon, and had been left for vine-dressers and for husbandmen (Jer. lii. 16) in Judæa, retained consequently their fathers' type of writing; nor would they admit that they who came from Babylon should abolish that type, and instal the character of writing which they had learnt in captivity as the sacred character in the copies of the law. Hence some of the people pertinaciously retained the Pentateuch in the old character, and to this fact we owe the precious advantage of having two distinct copies of the Pentateuch, one called the Hebrew, the other the Samaritan.

St. Jerome observes that the Hebrew and Samaritan letters differed in their *apices*, *κεφαλαίαι*, or projecting knobs. He perceived that the skeletons

of the letters were of the same genus in both writings, and that the feature distinctions were due to variation of species.

When a language ceases to be spoken its written words become dumb, and like the portraits of men who were not known as living men to those who look on them, require to be named to the spectator, or to be inscribed with their names, in order to their being recognised and known. So when the Hebrew language had become obsolete, it required a nomenclator to read it ; and when such men, who inherited a traditionary skill in reading it, were scattered, and on the verge of disappearing altogether, learners who sought to acquire from them the art of rightly reading the Hebrew Scriptures used helps to record and preserve the right pronunciation given by the master, jotting down on the unvowelled text before them arbitrary marks indicating, singly or when combined, the modulation of the teacher, as, in reading to them, he vowelled this or that syllable.

This method, a mere scholar's expedient at first, was afterwards elaborated into the system of Hebrew vowel points, by the help of which the Hebrew text is readable by us.

These auxiliaries to reading seem to have come into use at about the same time as did the Greek accents; but neither the inventor of Hebrew vowel points nor of Greek accents is known.\*

In affixing these vowel sounds to the Hebrew original text, the Rabbin asserted and exercised an authority over the text, and the correctness of their judgment is fairly open to criticism: the meaning of a word is often altogether at the mercy of the vowel points. Between the second and third verses of the 91st Psalm is a little word which the Greek translators seem to have mistaken to mean *not*, but the Rabbin have rightly vowel-pointed it so as to make it mean *God*; and so the Syrian version, made before the vowel points were used, has translated it. In all ambiguous cases they may not have been so happy. In some cases the Rabbin differ among themselves as to the proper vowel points to be assigned.

The correct Hebrew text itself is singularly well

\* The usefulness of the method was perceived by the Arabs, who add vowel points to the text of the Qoran (but not to other writings), to stereotype the pronunciation and, in some degree, the meaning of its text.



ascertained. In very few instances, in proportion to its bulk, are readings suspected to be questionable. A multitude of various readings detected by Kennicott, De Rossi, and others, are variations merely in vowel-pointing by the Rabbin.

2. The Old Testament has been too vaguely looked on as a book, whereas it is the Ecclesiastic Library of the Jews, the accumulated literature of a thousand years, not the popular but the ecclesiastical and national literature. The mouth of Balaam foretold that the people of Israel should not be reckoned among the nations, and they are in no respects more distinct in habits from other nations than in the peculiar provision for the preservation of one portion of their literature, that which was not the fruit of genius, but the result of inspiration. No other nation being favoured with oracles from God, no other nation required such provision for the perpetual preservation of writings.

The Ten Commandments, the basis of their religion, were inscribed on slabs of stone, and laid up in a wooden ark, which it was not lawful to touch.

The written law was laid up by the side of this



ark. *Put this book*, said Moses of the Law, *by the side of the Ark* (Deut. xxxi. 26), not *inside the Ark*, as versions have it. And when Samuel had written *the manner of the kingdom in a book*, he *laid it up before the Lord* (1 Sam. x. 25), that is to say, at the place where men worshipped by prostration, which place was called *Before the Lord*. Which words show that canonical writings were deposited outside the veil of the Temple.

Hence we may perhaps obtain some notion of the manner in which genuine inspired writings and prophecies were added to the canon of Scripture, whilst uncanonical and false prophecies could never obtain admission and canonicity.

The first mention of a prophetic admonition committed to writing, addressed, not to the nation but to an individual, is where we read, *there came to Jehoram a writing from Elijah the prophet* (2 Chron. xxi. 12). The writer is called Elijah the prophet to distinguish him from Elijah the Tishbite.

The earliest instance of the divine command to write what a prophet had been inspired to utter, is where Isaiah is commanded by the Lord to write what he had foretold to Ahaz (Is. viii.).

Isaiah proceeded to select two faithful witnesses, the number required by the law, witnesses, that is to say, to the authenticity of the document, one of which was Uriah, who, it would appear, was the high priest (see 2 Kings xvi. 10). The words *Bind up the testimony* (or rather, the things witnessed to), *seal the law* (ver. 16), probably have reference to the securing and verifying the prophecy written in the great roll with a man's pen, and witnessed by the two priests (ver. 2).

These details connected with the first great prophecies of the prophets, thus circumstantially given, show us how writings were certified as inspired; the document would be exhibited to the priests, who, ascertaining its authenticity, would lay it up in the Temple. It is most probable that the scribes of the Temple would copy it; and, in doing so, would affix a title to it, such as those continually met with, *e.g.*, *The vision of Isaiah, the son of Amoz. The burden of Damascus. The writing of Hezekiah when he was sick.* Such headings are not necessarily parts of Scripture.

The title to the roll which began with the twenty-fifth chapter of Proverbs, is instructive on

the matter, *These are also proverbs of Solomon, which the men of Hezekiah, King of Judah, copied out.* The Syriac says *brother-in-law* (relatives), the Septuagint *the friends* of Hezekiah. The time referred to was the time of the reformation of religion under that king. The form of the title is an evidence of the care and precaution observed with respect to the certificate of authenticity required to be found on every canonical roll.

It is almost certain that *the men of King Hezekiah* were commissioners appointed by him to renew the rolls of Scripture, when other things in it were renewed (2 Chron. xxix. 19). The Hebrew text says, *which the men of Hezekiah extracted.*

We find that St. Paul took the precaution of ensuring the authenticity of his Epistles by his own sign manual: to one of the earliest (2 Thess. penult. verse) adding, *in all my Epistles so I write.* This is inserted but once, and apparently then because he suspected that the Thessalonians had been imposed on by a spurious epistle (ii. 3). We have thus information given us how the authenticity of the New Testament Scriptures was

certified. Isaiah shows us how it was done in the days of the ancient prophets.

This also shows us why the Book of Jasher, the works of Solomon on natural history, and the great mass of Solomon's songs, have not been preserved to us; they were not inspired, and therefore not enrolled nor laid up in the Temple. The Books of Chronicles, being the work of the king's recorder, not of the Temple scribes, were not, and are not, reckoned canonical by the Jews. Histories may be true and authentic, though not canonical.

If an opinion may be offered as to how the sacred rolls were preserved, the most probable seems to be that they were enclosed in earthen cylinders.

*Take these evidences*, said Jeremiah to Baruch, alluding to documents certified by witnesses and sealed, *and put them in an earthen vessel, that they may continue many days* (Jer. xxxii. 14). These words show us the usual method of securing written rolls. When St. Paul said, *this treasure we have in earthen vessels*, he may have been mentally likening the light in his heart, the inspired knowledge in it, in the earthly vessel of the body, to the treasures of inspiration contained in earthen

vessels in the Temple of old. And possibly he has some allusion to these earthen vessels when he says, of the spiritual house of God, comparing it with the material Temple, *In a great house are not only vessels of gold and silver, but also of wood and of earth* (2 Tim. ii. 20).

The whole East testifies to the explorer that the works proceeding from the potter's wheel were used for all purposes, and were in many instances of such beauty and grace of form as to be fit for vessels of honour even in the Temple; the eastern potter surpassed his fellows, the sculptor and caster of metal work, in the variety and elegance of his works.

Fictile vessels also were most likely to escape the hand of the spoiler, and the rust and the moth did not affect them. Jeremiah, to secure his title-deeds from the approaching spoiler, as we have seen, enclosed them in an earthen vessel. The gold and the silver articles in the Temple were the first seized. The more precious rolls in their earthen cylinders would escape the plunderer's hand.

It may seem strange that we have no mention



of the fate of the precious rolls on those occasions when regret for the gold and silver carried away by the spoiler is expressed; none are mentioned as brought back from Babylon, though even knives are recorded. The conclusion is that the plunderers overlooked them. Their preservation is the more miraculous; the Lord hid them in the hollow of his hand. It is, perhaps, not to be hoped for, that if ever the vaults with which the Temple area is honeycombed are opened to the explorer, any Temple rolls will be recovered; but yet, *out of the eater came forth meat*, when records confirming the Scriptures were found in the carcase of Nineveh, the city of the king who destroyed Israel.

There was therefore formed in the Temple the Great Jewish Library, which we call the Old Testament Scriptures. The law, as the Books of Moses were called, at least the autograph law, would appear to have been beside the ark, not in it, within the veil.

A book of the law was carried by the judge who went his circuit, that he might decide cases out of it; for in the East, *to open the book* means to give a decision *al pi hattorah*, *by the mouth of the*

law. *The books were opened, and the dead were judged*  
A *out of those things written in the books* (Rev. xx. 12).

The ceremonial law was well known to the people ; it was kept in remembrance by the daily habits of their lives.

Thus the ceremonial law was widely known among the people ; and the moral law to some ; but it cannot be supposed that the writings of the prophets were ever known to them, from writings ; though many of their prophecies must have become current. No doubt a vast mass of the Scripture, known to many now, was as little known to the people of Judah and Israel as Hooker's works or Bishop Butler's writings to the generality of Englishmen.

The Jews did not call Scripture *the Word of God*, as we do ; but any information given to them by the priest's lips they spoke of as *a word from the Lord*. *Is there any word from the Lord*, asked Zedekiah of Jeremiah.\*

\* So completely had this notion of the meaning of the Word of the Lord obtained in the latest times, that the Rabbin illustrate the spiritual destitution foretold in the words *a famine of hearing the Word*, by a supposed state of things when, for want of priests to



Yet were there among all classes of the people three great and invaluable truths, firmly held even by the most ignorant : first, that they had a law given them directly from God ; secondly, that misery was the consequence of sin, not of blind chance ; and thirdly that a Deliverer was coming.

Even the depraved Samaritan woman, whom our Lord met at Jacob's well, knew the creed, *I know that Messias cometh*. And this belief was naturally expressed thus plainly by a woman's lips, for the minds of Jewish women were moulded by the hope of finding the Messiah born of one of themselves, or of their daughters ; for this was *the grace*, χάρις, promised to the Jewish woman, as to be the flesh of the Messiah was the grace promised to the Jewish man. The angel who announced to the Virgin Mary that she was the chosen mother of the promised Redeemer, expressed

consult, a woman could not get information as to whether an insect in the oven had rendered the batch of bread unclean. It would appear that gradually the office of the teaching priest was almost confined to solving nice questions as to ceremonial cleanliness or uncleanness. The instance adduced above, from Maimonides, makes us feel very strongly our Lord's observations about the Word of God and the traditions of the Elders.

the fact to her by declaring that she was the *κεχαριτωμένη*, the one who had at last received the gift of the *χάρις*.

3. But though the circulation of the Scriptures was unknown among the ancient Jews, we have such evidence as we should expect to find, that the preservation of them, and the providing of such copies as were required were well cared for.

The scribe always was in honour; in our Lord's days, indeed, the title ranked among the highest; and the Oriental penman was beneath no artificer in the beauty of his work, and in skill and devotion to it; he was the slave of unreasoning instinctive accuracy of reproduction; and from his social and ecclesiastical position, this peculiar mould of his mind greatly tended to make the literal and formal condition of the text to be more considered and more valued by him than the spirit and meaning of it.

But this evil was made by Providence an instrument towards the preservation of the text for the use of the people to come, who should delight in searching out its *spirit*; for, owing to this instinct in the Jewish scribe, the copy of a roll

resembled the original as exactly as the bird's nest of the year resembles the first nest constructed by the first bird of the species.

The scribe appears in the Temple, and offices for his use are mentioned. When Baruch had read Jeremiah's prophecy to the great men, they made inquiries as to its origin and genuineness, and Baruch answered, *He pronounced all these words with his mouth, and I wrote them with ink in the book* (Jer. xxxvi. 18).

He read the roll to them in the chamber of Gemariah, the son of Shaphan, *the scribe*, and it was laid up in the chamber of Elishamah, *the scribe*, in the Temple; from whence the king had to send for it. They sent it from the chamber in which it was read to the chamber of the scribe, which suggests that it was for the purpose of its being copied.

Huldah the prophetess dwelt in Jerusalem, in a place which is called the *Mishna*, a word meaning *a copy*, but translated *college* in our version. Her father-in-law was keeper of the wardrobe or garments, most probably the Temple vestry; and she being a relative of an officer of the Temple, and a prophetess, would naturally be found lodged in one

of the multitude of apartments that so clustered the Temple walls and courts that it was a town in itself.

It is not impossible that the name of her apartment, *the Mishna*,\* indicates the offices of the copyists attached to the Temple; which, in those evil days, were unoccupied and unused by the scribes, and, like all other parts of the Temple, had been diverted to baser uses. For since the finding of the Temple copy of the law in the Temple was, in that age, as the discovery of some ancient inscription in these days, the care and copying of the Scriptures must have ceased for some time; and the various apartments of the Temple must have been turned

\* The word *mishna* in biblical Hebrew means a copy, or duplicate; Deuteronomy is called a mishna of the law: and the king was commanded to make for himself a mishna, or copy of the manner of the kingdom, the statute respecting the regal duties written by Samuel and incorporated now into Deuteronomy, which contains duplicates of many statutes made in Israel and codified in that book. The Aramaics dialectically pronounced the Hebrew *sh* as *th*, and also wrote the one letter for the other: with them *mishna* is *mithna*. But until instances are adduced of the dialectic conversion of *th* into *sh*, it cannot be admitted that *mishna* comes from the root *thanah*, to teach. *Talmud*, not *mishna*, means theological doctrine.

to common uses ; so that Huldah's living in one of them need excite no surprise.

It has been suggested that Huldah dwelt in the *second* part of Jerusalem, for *mishna* is a second production of an original, a copy, δευτέρωσις, *secunda editio*, as the word is translated in Justinian's decree. But there is no trace of such a term as the *second part* of Jerusalem, or of any town ; though the word Jerusalem has, in some places, been vowelled by the Rabbin so as to appear in the dual number ; and, indeed, was a town with a double acropolis, a sacred and a regal one.

But the term *mishna*, applied to a town, would have the sense of *ambiguus* in Horace's expression *ambiguam Salamina*, a duplicate of the old town. We are therefore driven to look elsewhere for a meaning for the *mishna* as a residence, and the most probable seems *the copyist's house*, or *duplicate office*.

Whilst on the subject of the transcription of records, especially sacred ones, it is not impertinent to notice the fact that no Eastern scribe began his work without heading it by some solemn formula, such as the heading to the book Deu-



teronomy, affixed by the Arab scribe, *In the name of God, the merciful and gracious, we begin the fifth book, and it is the book of Repetition.* The scribe who copied the Samaritan Targum closes with the words, *The law is finished, blessed be the Giver of it.* The scribe's name was also almost invariably appended by himself; we have a trace of this custom in the words, *I, Tertius, who wrote this epistle, salute you in the Lord* (Rom. xvi. 22). The solemnity connected with the act of transcribing in the East, and the instinctive *στοργή* of the Jews for the Scripture rolls, and the Eastern scribe's scrupulousness in reproducing the original before him, when appreciated, greatly justify the other reasons which we have for believing in the perfect authenticity of the Scriptures.

And though it cannot be affirmed that all that the Lord has spoken to man, or all that He commanded to be written, has been preserved; as, similarly, it cannot be affirmed that every tree good for food that was planted in Eden has been preserved; yet, even as fruits of the earth in abundance for the wants of man, both for food and healing, remain constant in their nutritive and sanative

virtues; so, not bread alone, but the words that have proceeded from the mouth of the Lord have also been preserved in abundance with their unalterable property for strengthening faith and healing the soul.



## II.

1. Rehabilitation of the Hebrew Scriptures by Ezra.—2. Unconcern of the Early Church for the Hebrew text when taking over the Old Testament.—3. The Old Testament came into the Church in the form of a Jewish Greek translation.—4. The order of the matter in some books dislocated.—5. Its re-ordering desirable.

1. ON the restoration of a Jewish commonwealth at Jerusalem by the chiefs of that portion of the captive people which returned to their native land, Ezra, priest and scribe, probably the representative of the hereditary Temple scribe, was inspired to renew the rolls of the Temple. He and his coadjutors brought the several books and writings for the first time into one collection; giving them very nearly the arrangement which they occupy now in the volume long known in Christianity as the Bible, or Bibliotheca.

It is reasonable to suppose that the Books of Moses and the Psalms would come to Ezra's hands

in a very perfect state ; at least in such condition as they had been in long before the captivity—the Books of Moses, from having been known and used as *the law* ; the Psalms, from the familiarity of all Levites with their contents.

But books such as Joshua, and the writings of the Prophets, would come into Ezra's hands in a less settled form ; Joshua, and some other books, from their antiquity, and from the little need there was of renewed copies in times when they were not *read* for any practical purposes ; the writings of the Prophets, because the Prophets could not have issued connected copies of their writings. The several prophetic writings, such as those of Isaiah and Jeremiah, must first have been on loose and detached parchments, and if these had ever been classified and digested into order, that order was liable to be disarranged by various accidents. Probably every heading and title in the Book of Isaiah marks the beginning of a separate parchment roll, its date being rarely indicated.

Though we have an allusion to the harps of the Temple choristers as taken with them to Babylon, and though even such things as the knives for

sacrifices are mentioned in the catalogue of things brought back from Babylon, there is no allusion whatever in the Jewish records to any preservation of the rolls of the Temple at the taking of Jerusalem, nor to any bringing back of rolls of Scripture from Babylon. Jerusalem, however, had not been so destroyed, nor the land so depopulated as to render it doubtful whether rolls of the Scriptures would be forthcoming.

The Samaritan Pentateuch may possibly be the representative in type of letter, and in matter, of a copy of the law preserved in the land during the captivity. The Samaritan notion, that the Pentateuch alone is Scripture, is itself probably the notion on the subject which was universal among the people before Ezra's compilation.

It was after Ezra's days that synagogues appeared, and that the public reading of the Prophets as well as the law was introduced; Providence ordering it so that the words of prophecy might be sown broadcast over the land, because the ages of expectation were fast running out, and Christ, of whom the Prophets spoke, was drawing near.

Ezra's work on the sacred rolls was therefore that

of an *editor*. He had to exercise that judgment which is required in every one who has to produce a genuine text from various manuscripts before him, and to digest various and detached writings into one consistent whole. It is not doubted that he had the assistance of the Spirit in the work, but this does not exclude the use of judgment. His work had not for its object a critical, literary, editing of the Scriptures, in which judgment only would be required, but the restoration of a shattered text under the guidance of the Spirit.

We need not, therefore, be surprised at finding chronological inconsistencies exhibited in the sequence of paragraphs, and repetitions of matters appearing elsewhere. The work was not done in the interests of chronology, and Ezra would rather repeat than omit anything genuine. Of the same event he may have found two distinct records, each as authentic as a Gospel, yet each having its peculiar points, as we see is the case in the Gospels.

In some cases, also, as Rabbi David Kimchi reasonably suggests, Ezra may have been obliged, from several manuscripts, none perfect, to compile a

complete text of a book, such as the Book of Joshua, supplying himself with matter out of another manuscript where the manuscript before him was decayed or wanting. He could hardly avoid displacing paragraphs in such a process of compilation.

The Scriptures have never been re-edited since Ezra's work. Hillel's recension may vary from Ezra's text in a slight degree, but it was not a new edition of the Scriptures; and when the re-editing of a book—Exodus for instance—is suggested, no alteration of the original text by the adoption of proposed various readings is suggested. For all useful purposes there is no other Hebrew text than the one in use. Justifiable emendations of it would have but an insignificant effect on it; but there are good reasons for suspecting that the order of the matter, though left by Ezra as it had long been, is not the original order in many books.

The Septuagint Greek version was by no means a re-edition of the Hebrew Scriptures; in all the specialities that constitute an edition it falls very far short of Ezra's work. St. Jerome doubtlessly did produce, in one sense, a new edition of the Old



Testament; but the framers of the English authorised version simply concocted a translation; they did not edit the Bible in any sense. The work still remains to be done by the Church.

2. The unconcern of the early Church for the Hebrew text appears marvellous, when we consider the power which the acquisition of the Hebrew language and the knowledge of the original text would have given to the Church in the first centuries of her existence, especially in dealing with, and controverting, the Jews.

But the Hebrew text of the Scriptures passes out of sight for all practical purposes. In the ancient records of the Church the Fathers cannot be said to have made any use of it; yet the study which they gave to profane Greek literature, if bestowed on the Hebrew, would have made them masters of it. But the Septuagint was the Hebrew Scripture to them.

The utter ignorance of the Hebrew text among the Fathers is nowhere more evident than in Tertullian's argument against some who asserted that the Hebrew Genesis began with the words, *In the beginning God created for Himself a Son* (In

Praxeas V.) ; instead of appealing to the Hebrew, he says, *hoc ut firmum non sit alia me deducunt argumenta*, refuting the mistranslation by subtleties concerning the manner of God's existence. If the Church had possessed any authorised version he might have appealed to it. But it would seem that, in the early centuries of the Church, the interpretation of the Old Testament was left to private judgment.

The Greek Septuagint, we know, widely prevailed among the Jews, but they always had a strong preference for the original, and would have used it exclusively had they not lost the language. The mob at Jerusalem listened in silence when they heard St. Paul addressing them in a Hebrew dialect ; and many Jewish converts may have been of those who eschewed the Greek Septuagint, and heard the Scriptures read from the Hebrew, and translated to them into their current Aramaic dialect by the interpreter in the Synagogue.

Such converts, it has been supposed, were those Hebrews who murmured against the Hellenists (Acts vi.), and for the use of such St. Matthew wrote his Gospel in the Aramaic dialect ; but this



text of his Gospel was so soon supplanted and obliterated by its Greek counterpart, as to make it evident that the great body of the Church westward from Judæa adopted the Greek Scriptures exclusively ; whilst the other great body eastward used exclusively the Syriac Peshito. It is with the great Western communities only that we have to do. Origen alone did anything to preserve the Hebrew text in the Church. He inserted the Hebrew text with the equivalent Greek letters in the two first columns of his “Hexapla,” in which he also inserted a revised text of the Septuagint ; but his invaluable work found no copyists nor readers.

St. Jerome went to the Jews to seek the Hebrew text, and, having found it among them, left it with them, as a thing of no use to the Church, and not needful to be added to her muniments.

The powerful influence of the Greek version in confirming the Gospel among Jewish converts, and the use made of it by the Apostles, had made the Septuagint utterly hateful to the unconverted Jews, who consequently betook themselves with a revived zeal to the study of the language of Moses, and painfully reacquired that amount of acquaintance

with that ancient language of their ancestors which enabled one of their learned men to give such assistance as he did to St. Jerome. So generally did the knowledge of Hebrew dry up, that even Philo Judæus could not distinguish between Hebrew and Chaldee, and, writing in Greek, betrays his ignorance of the Hebrew.

The letter and language of the ancient oracles of God, the title-deeds of the Church, were as unknown to the ancient Church as the letter and language of an Anglo-Saxon charter to the generality of Englishmen in the present day. When the Fathers speak of the Jewish Scriptures they mean the Septuagint; and when St. Augustine says, "The Jews are our librarians; they bring the books to us when we study," the Greek version is alluded to.

It is to the unconverted fragments of the Jewish people that the Christian Church owes the preservation of the Old Testament in the original language of its authors. They also edited the first printed editions of it at Venice, about the time when the ecclesiastical power of the day was exercising itself in judging and burning John Huss, at Constance, for attempting to expound the Scriptures.

3. The early ancient Church utterly ignored the Hebrew text of the Old Testament; and it is not plain whether the collective Church, by any act, ever took over the Old Testament, or sanctioned and recognised any special preferable text of its Scriptures, even in the Greek language.

We find the ancient Church using, besides the New Testament, a Bibliotheca, whence our word Bible. Tertullian says that there might be seen in his days, in the Serapeion at Alexandria, *Bibliothecæ cum ipsis Hebraicis literis*, volumes containing the Greek Septuagint version together with the Hebrew text.

These ancient Bibliothecæ seem to have been collections of sacred and devotional works, the production, by compilation, of individual zealous men. The nucleus of the Bibliotheca was the Greek version of the Old Testament. But the germ of the collection was the Pentateuch, and with it probably the Psalter.

The Greek version of the Pentateuch is so superior to the versions of all other books, that the historical translators, sent to King Ptolemy with the rolls from Jerusalem, probably translated only it. It shows evidence of being the work of men conversant with

Jewish rites and customs. The versions of the other books are very inferior in accuracy. In the Pentateuch there is not a Hebrew term that is not translated; even names, such as *La chai roi* and *Jehovah Jireh*, are translated. In the other books many Hebrew words are transferred untranslated; and the version of some books, such as Hosea, is very wide of the original; and in some places the Greek version gives no perceptible sense.

The other sacred books of the Jews thus seem to have been translated as they best could, and added to the Pentateuch; to them, books such as Enoch and the Maccabees and others were added, the Maccabees having lived after the days of Ptolemy's interpreters.

Thus additions were made gradually to the Bibliotheca, and to such additions we may suppose St. Jerome alludes when he speaks of successive copyists adding what they thought good, *quisque pro arbitrio suo*. He may refer to such additions as that of the history of Susannah to the beginning, and the history of Bel and the Dragon to the end, of the Book of Daniel; or to the substitution of Theodotion's version of Daniel, containing these, for the

original version of the Seventy in the Church Bibliotheca ; of which substitution St. Jerome says "*id cur acciderit plane nescio*," words which at once justify us in concluding that the Church never troubled herself about the condition of the Old Testament. A similar Bibliotheca was formed, by aggregation, on the nucleus of the Gospels, but the Church from the first eliminated apocryphal Gospels, Acts, and Epistles from her New Testament.

What St. Paul had left with Carpus, and what he desired Timothy to bring with him when he came, which our version calls *a cloak*, appears from the Syriac version to have been a Bibliotheca, *Beth Kitab*, a collection of sacred and religious books. From such a Bibliotheca St. Paul quotes the opposition of Jannes and Jambres to Moses ; and from such a collection St. Jude quotes the prophecy of Enoch and the contention between Michael and Satan for the body of Moses. Their readers knew well whence they quoted such things ; and the inspired writers, in making references to the uninspired volumes of the Bibliotheca,\* naturally do so without

\* Hence we may know that the citation, *Eye hath not seen*, &c. (1 Cor. ii. 9), being introduced by the formula *ὥς γέγραπται*, must



the formula, *as it is written*, which they employ to designate quotations from inspired books.

The scribe of the Old Dispensation seems to have been represented in the Christian Church by the Bibliothecarius, often a Cœnobite, who would insert important works in suitable places between the books of the volumes he copied. Thus we find the treatise of Athanasius on the Psalms preceding the Psalms in the Cottonian MS. (A translation of this treatise is similarly inserted in Matthew Parker's Bible.)

The Bibliothecarius obtained works for insertion into the collection both from the Fathers of the Church and also from Hellenistic Jews, from whom must have been obtained the Greek text of the first Book of Maccabees, the Aramaic original of which was till extant in St. Jerome's days.

There was, however, always among the Fathers and Bishops of the Church a tacit acknowledgment of the inspired books, as of authority, in contradistinction to all other books in the Bibliotheca; these other books being also, in process of time,

be a quotation from Isaiah, and cannot be, as some suggest, from a liturgy. The formula, *as it is written*, used by an inspired writer, stamps the book from which he quotes as being inspired Scripture.



further divided into ἀντιλεγόμενα, *questionable*, and ἀπόκρυφα, *books for private reading*, but it does not appear that this was done by any decision of the collective Church, but by common, perhaps not universal, consent.

St. Jerome opens his celebrated "Prologus Galeatus" with the theory of an equal number of books in the Hebrew Scriptures and of letters in the Hebrew alphabet; with the refinement on the theory which required that, as five of the Hebrew letters had each two forms, initial and final, it was significant of the division of five books, each into two volumes.

St. Jerome tabulates the canon of Scripture very much as the council at Carthage did; and as St. Augustine, who was present at the council, does in his book "De Doctrinâ Christianâ." But St. Jerome writes as an *individual*, not citing any council as giving the authority of the collective Church for his statements; and the present question is as to the action of the collective Church, not of individuals, in taking over the Old Testament.

However, St. Jerome, in his preface to the book "Judith," tells us that he translated that book

because he read that the Nicene Synod reckoned it part of Holy Scripture: "*Hunc librum numero sanctarum Scripturarum legitur computasse.*" There must have been, therefore, at least a tradition that a canon of Scripture was recognised by the Fathers at that council; but we observe that the Church of England, in her sixth article, justifies her canon, not by appeal to any council, but by the assertion that *there was never any doubt in the Church* of the authority of the books enumerated.

The Apostles knew that the Church of the New Covenant had succeeded to the inheritance of the vineyard from which the Jews had been ejected, and that consequently the muniments of the Old Covenant belonged to the Church.

In whatever other respects the Jewish Church had been unfaithful, it had certainly been not merely passively faithful, but extremely diligent, in preserving the Scriptures whole and uncorrupted.

What is sought for in the ancient Christian Church is some proof of collective authority in taking over the Jewish Scriptures, certifying what were those books; an act unnecessary, indeed, so long as the Church preached Christ to the Jews exclu-

sively, for they never denied their sacred books ; but of the first importance when the Church addressed herself to the Gentiles, who knew not those books, and, on account of the opposition of the Jews, required the Gentiles to believe that the Church of Christ understood the Scriptures of the Church of Levi better than the Levites themselves did.

The acute Tertullian perceived the necessity of showing that Christians and Jews both agreed as to what were the Jewish Scriptures, for after referring inquirers to the Hebrew Scriptures, and the Greek version of them still in the Serapeion, he adds, “*sed et Judæi palam lectitant,*” to show that the Greek version was recognised as Scripture, not by the Church only, but openly by the Jews.

Probably some porch of the Serapeion was used as a synagogue by the Alexandrian Jews, for permission to use which they paid some tax, and to this Tertullian alludes when he says, “*Judæi palam lectitant, vectigalis libertas, vulgo aditur omnibus sabbatis.*” (Apol. c. 18.)

It is obvious that the opposing arguments of the Jews could be much better met in the presence of the Gentiles, on many points, by showing the una-

nimity of Jews and Christians concerning the ancient Scriptures, than by charging the Jews with having mutilated the Scriptures in order to deprive the Church of texts telling in favour of the doctrines which she preached to the Gentiles. But this Justin Martyr does; he charges the Jews with having struck out of the Septuagint Jeremiah the following passage: ἐμνήσθη δὲ κύριος ὁ Θεὸς ἀπὸ Ἰσραὴλ τῶν νεκρῶν αὐτοῦ τῶν κεκοιμημένων εἰς γῆν χώματος, καὶ κατέβη πρὸς αὐτοὺς ἐναγγελίσασθαι αὐτοῖς τὸ σῶτηριον αὐτοῦ.—(Dial. cum Tryphone, c. 72.)

If this passage was ever found in the Septuagint, it certainly is not found in the Hebrew text. Justin Martyr's statement concerning it is cited here to show the need that there was of establishing, by testimony of the Church, not only the number of canonical books, but also a certified text of their contents.

Origen laboured at restoring a correct text of the Septuagint. His work was that of an individual, and it does not appear that the Church concerned itself to sanction a canonical text; and an observation by St. Jerome leads us to suppose that, at Alexandria, a text edited by Hesychius (not the

lexicographer) was preferred ; at Constantinople, a text revised by Lucian, the martyr bishop.

But the labours, bestowed by holy and zealous men on the Old Testament, were labours, not on the Hebrew, but on the Greek Alexandrian version of the original made about three centuries before Christ ; and even of this version we do not find that any Catholic text was recognised.

The Jews, meantime, had even increased in diligence in securing the Hebrew text from possible depravation, and in fixing it, by various contrivances, such as that of numbering the verses and words in every book, and especially by signifying the received pronunciation of the words, on which their very meaning often depends exclusively, by a system of vowel-points and accents, combining the methods of vocalisation, musical notation, and punctuation, which about the same time, probably in the fifth century, began to be invented.

St. Jerome, by his individual authority and *private judgment*, pronounced on the canon, and produced a Latin text, much as Luther, under the same conditions, produced a German Bible and banished the Apocrypha from the canon. Something like



infallibility was tacitly attributed to St. Jerome as a translator of Scripture and orderer of the canon, and for twelve centuries his version was left to take care of itself.

Considering how popular some Apocryphal Gospels had by that time become, especially in Egypt, it is surprising that the question of a canon of Scripture did not claim the attention of the great council at Nicæa. It might have served the truth better, if, instead of laboriously defining the precedence of patriarchs, the council had defined the canonical books of the Bibliotheca. The discussion of the question, *τίς μέιζων*, "who shall be the greatest," which our Lord had deprecated, surged up in the council; and concern for the Scriptures has been too often subordinated to vain janglings about precedence of bishops in the councils of the Collective Church. Hence it is so difficult to ascertain when the Collective Church ever took over the Jewish Scriptures, and what books they sanctioned.

The ancient Jews divided their sacred books into *the Law*, *the Writings*, and *the Prophets*. In later times, the masters of the Cabbala decided on reckoning the sacred books as twenty-two in number, that



there might be one for every letter of the Hebrew alphabet. Josephus, who had no more than a tincture of Rabbinical knowledge, having asserted twenty-two books of Scripture, Eusebius quotes him on the point as of authority.

The council at Laodicea, A.D. 372, first *canonises* twenty-two books of the Old Testament, ignoring the Apocrypha.

The council at Carthage, twenty years later, admits Tobit, Wisdom, two books of Maccabees.

But although we thus, at last, find the Church in council caring for a catalogue of the books of Scripture, we do not find any steps taken for ensuring an authentic and catholic text of the books. We must suppose that individual bishops concerned themselves, each in his province, to sanction the text of the Old Testament Scriptures used by his clergy.

St. Gregory of Nyssa speaks of ἀντίγραφα ἀκριβέστατα, *most correct copies*, and St. Augustine gives the preference to one reading because he finds it in *exemplaribus probatioribus*; but such expressions show the need, not the existence, of a standard text in the Church.

Tertullian, however, says, *nos edimus Evangelia*,

*we set forth gospels*, when refuting the corrupted Gospels circulated by heretics; and speaks of genuine texts as *nostri libri*; and undoubtedly the text and the canon of the New Testament was more cared for than were those of the Old. The Gospels were *enthroned* in the place where a council was held. The Old Testament rarely seems to have been appealed to in early councils, but at the pseudo-œcumenical Nicene, in the eighth century, passages relating to the cherubim over the mercy-seat were adduced as attesting the *efficacy* of images in churches. The fact that these cherubim never could be seen does not appear to have occurred to the council.

It was not till the council at Trent that *the Vulgate* was canonised, in the fourth session, April, 1546; and by a prescript the council entrusted the production of an authoritative text to the Bishop of Rome. In 1590 such a text was published, but was found unsatisfactory, and two years afterwards Clement VIII. issued and sanctioned a Latin text of the Scriptures for use in the Roman obedience. It inclines to the Septuagint rather than to the Hebrew sense.

The Franciscan, Richard du Mans, had urged on the council that no promulgation of the Scriptures was needed, the scholastic theology being sufficient to prove all truths and dogmas. But ecclesiastical authority, armed with the weapons of the schoolmen, had long trodden down and robbed the Scriptures; the cup had been stolen from the Gospel apparatus of the Eucharist; the power of binding and loosing had been purloined from the Apostles, and offered for sale in the shape of indulgences to the people by the thieves; the Scriptures had fallen among thieves, who had left it half dead.

The Augustinian Luther may have been a rough and uncourtly man compared with the polished Franciscan Richard du Mans; some still would revile Luther as a Samaritan compared with the mediæval bishops and doctors; but all must grant that he was the good Samaritan to the Scriptures. By translating them into his own language he, as it were, set them on his own beast.

The English authorised version, 1611, by coming closer to the Hebrew than any other, surpasses all translations and editions of the Old Testament, and has acquired an œcumenical estimation as

giving most faithfully the sense of the Scriptures ; which sense, and not the letter, is the Word from God.

If the English version has proved a mother of discordant opinion, it has been so because the translation which it gives of the Old Testament was not followed by an authorised interpretation ; besetting slothfulness was only too ready to accept it as final, and as sparing the Church any further trouble about the meaning of Scripture ; and the authorised version was accepted without demur in England, as an Act of Parliament is accepted, which the people often understand one way, and which the learned in the law interpret in a different way, in places.

After the appearance of the authorised version, it fared in England with the study of the original language of Scripture as, after Newton's experiment with the prism, it fared with the investigation of the properties of light. When Newton had laid down the prism, no one handled it again for a century. Newton was held to have seen in the spectrum all that was to be seen, and to have done with the prism all that could be done, or needed to be done. So

King James's translators were willingly thought to have done all that was required, and to have seen in the Hebrew Scriptures all that was to be seen in them. But, in fact, they had done little more, when they published their translation, than prepare and collect appliances, tools, and scaffolding, as it were, for the construction of an interpretation. It must be borne in mind that the framers of the English version were bound to work after a certain scheme, which was not such as a critic and scholar could sanction.

The Hebrew text and the sun meanwhile have remained unaltered ; but since the days of Newton the sun, through a prism more cunningly manipulated, has disclosed properties in its light more than he detected. It needed but to make the prism revolve in the ray, and light disclosed its property, called its polarizability ; when a needle was immersed in the purple ray, the sun disclosed his magnetising power. Language, since the days of King James's translators, has been manipulated with even greater results than the prism since the days of Newton, and the Hebrew text will now interpret itself to the philologist more fruitfully than it did to them.

When the Jewish Scriptures were taken over at



last, in the fourth century, by the Church in council; as that council sat at Carthage, it is reasonable to suppose that it had in view the version of the books in the African Latin Bibliotheca made from the Greek Septuagint version.

The next council which sanctioned a canon of Scripture, that at Laodicea, must have had in view a Greek Septuagint text.

But in both cases it was substantially a version of the Old Testament, made by the Jews three centuries before Christ, which the Church took over without any thought of confronting it with the original, or of inquiring whether a version made by Jews could have in it that light which a version made by the Church would have exhibited.

Undoubtedly we may recognise a dispensation of Divine Providence in the fact that the testimony out of the Old Testament laid before the Greek-speaking Jews was out of a version made by Jews so long before Christ was born, and one which had been sanctioned by the Jewish Church; for its text was evidence more unanswerable by them than if it had been the work of apostles or of any Christians.

But though this was providentially so ordered,



and though that version best served that most important purpose, the Old Testament is for other purposes besides that of persuading the Jews concerning Christ out of their own Scriptures. It is the Word of God to all nations, and is capable of confirming faith in Christ among people who do not inherit, as the Jews do, an expectation of Him, grounding that expectation on the ancient prophecies of the Old Testament. It is profitable to nations whose prejudices, prepossessions, mental peculiarities and habits are dissimilar to those of the Jews.

Every Jewish interpreter interpreted the Lord as the God of the Jew exclusively ; a Christian interpreter would discern in the Lord the God and Father of all men indifferently.

It is possible that if the Church had betaken herself to interpret the Old Testament with the spirit which she had received, so catholic a view of the dispensations of the Almighty would have been disclosed, that the Church might have been spared Marcion's slanderous cavils against the ways of the Lord, and the pestilent blasphemies of Manes, who thought he saw a destroyer in the Lord as revealed in the Old Testament.

What the ancient Church had not leisure to do should be done; the Church should pass by the Jewish Greek translators into the very Hebrew original, and view the Old Testament Scriptures, not by the light of the lamps of the Temple, but by the light of the Gospel, and set it forth as it discloses itself when illuminated by the Spirit of Christ.

4. It has also happened that the Church of Christ has the Old Testament Scriptures in a text in exactly the same condition of arrangement which they exhibited when published by Ezra, and used by the Jews for some centuries before Christ.

The Jews scrupulously refrained from correcting the misplacement or malformation of a letter when copying a roll of recognised genuineness and antiquity. The Christian has equally refrained from transposing paragraphs obviously misplaced, and from displacing a paragraph accidentally inserted in a place or book to which it does not belong.

The dislocations of the text are such that he who would understand what he reads must either frame an order of sequence for himself, or adopt one suggested by some biblical critic. Whilst studious men

are obliged to do this for themselves, and average readers do not suspect that it is needed, the Church has stood for long years looking on captiously at the student who makes experiments at a rearrangement of the text, and unconcernedly at the general reader who makes what he can out of a confused narrative; whilst popular commentators over-tax their ingenuity in attempting to dovetail together paragraphs which have no connection in reality. The result sometimes is a confusion of doctrine, sometimes of morality, stumbling-blocks to the reader, and opportunities to the scoffer.

For instance, in the book of the law as it now stands, the law of divorce and the law of marriage run parallel. The impression given by the common arrangement of the text is that the law contemplated divorce at the time that it hallowed marriage, for Exodus xxi. 10, referring to concubines and divorce, is placed as though it were a supplement to the seventh Commandment. Our Lord himself had to interpose on this point, and tell the Jewish exponents of the law that marriage had been from the beginning, but divorce tolerated only on account of the inveterate perverseness, *hardness of heart*, of

the people. But the Jews had the book of the law, as we have, in such a disordered arrangement that they naturally supposed divorce as lawful a thing as marriage.

It seems reasonable to presume that in very ancient times, long before the Captivity, the various precepts in the book Exodus were arranged in such order as to exhibit precepts and statutes, *mishpatim*, provided for particular cases of infraction of a law, in juxtaposition with the original law; so that the book was made one of ready reference for the judge who had to decide cases. Such an arrangement of the book would be of great utility in the Jewish commonwealth, but worse than useless in the Christian Church and community.

The Temple copy exhibiting the original order and continuity would decay or perish, and the only copies current would be those used by the judges on their circuits, or by the priests in adjudicating. Copies in this form only would come into Ezra's hands.

If this view is reasonable, a rearrangement—*re-edition*—of the book Exodus can be undertaken on a fixed principle and carried out methodically. A

clue to the primitive order being found, its recovery, the readjustment of the members of the book, is possible, and the attempt to do it is justified.

5. Many have satisfied themselves, as regards the apparent incompatibility of our Lord's precepts with some of those sanctioned in the Old Testament, by a vague supposition that the Lord, finding the law to have failed, changed the Spirit with which He had dealt with man when He sent the Saviour into the world. Some such notion as this is probably still the refuge of many who feel at times perplexed on the subject.

Many have been told that if they stumbled at an apparent inconsistency of Spirit in two places, they staggered for want of faith; whereas, in some cases, it was from a clear-sighted faith in Christ, as the manifestor of the nature of God, that they were able to perceive that there did lie a stumbling-block in the way, unremoved. And such would never have been left if the Church, on admitting the Jewish rolls into her muniments, had stirred up the spirit within her, and by the light of the Gospel had made the rough places smooth and the crooked places straight for the footsteps of believers in Christ.



Some places are crooked and rough, not from imperfect translation, but because the Jews so disposed the materials and component parts of Scripture as to encumber the way to the eternal moral law by interposing the apparatus of the temporary ceremonial law. The Gospel gives the Church light by which to see this, and the Spirit gives her strength and authority to *take up the stumbling-block out of the way of the people of the Lord* (Is. lvii. 14), and set everything in its proper place.

Such a work would be a *re-editing* of the Scriptures, having for its object the restoration of the original sequence of its component parts. Until this order is, as far as possible, recovered, mere translating, the more accurate it is, the more clearly will it show the want of consecutiveness in many places.

No one would take up the Scriptures to *re-edit* them as he would take up any mere book. The Church, contemplating the work, would think how great must have been the reverence and awe with which the angels, at the Lord's resurrection, disposed decently and in order the fine linen in which the Lord's body had been wrapped, and the napkin



that had been round his head. The Old Testament would be to her like the one, the New Testament of her Head like the other.

But none can expect the Church to undertake the work unless it appears, not only that there has evidently been a confused folding as it were of the original rolls, but also that they had been so disarranged for some temporary purpose, which purpose, having no longer any place, reason requires that they should be restored to their original order of arrangement or sequence of component parts.

It is presumed that a view of that portion of the book Exodus, which treats of the law, will show that there can be discerned in the present form of the book a disarrangement on the face of the record; and that a consideration of the use to which the book was applied by the Jews accounts satisfactorily for many transpositions of the matter of the original book.

The notion that the text of Exodus has at some early period been disposed, without regard to its original order, so as to make the book a code of laws and collection of cases, is strengthened by our observing that whilst its present arrangement is very

suitable for such a purpose, it is perfectly useless for the purposes of ready historical reference for the sequence of facts. The narrative, not needed for practical purposes, has been sacrificed to the legislation which was continually required for practical application. This is apparent when we notice that, if we read the book for the sake of the narrative, it is so confused that Moses is described as writing all the words of the law in a book, and binding the people to observe it, before he had ascended into the mount, as he was desired to do, that he might be taught the law.

When such things are well considered, since we know that it is possible to have a number of sentences so arranged that, however accurately each individually may be translated, their arrangement orderly gives one view of the subject, their transposed arrangement, another ; it becomes a question whether it is not of as great importance to endeavour to recover the original arrangement as to recover the real meaning of the several passages. It is quite possible, some will say it is evident, that the present arrangement perniciously amalgamates the moral law with statutes suffered but not approved

of. If this is so, then a re-editing of the book Exodus, the restoration of the text to its proper order, is of more importance than the revision of a good translation of it.

The replacement of the matter in the book Exodus into its original order is a thing of far more importance than any concern for the order in which the paragraphs in the other books of the Pentateuch stand. For in Exodus the separate and distinct sources of the moral, and of the ceremonial law, are indicated, or would be, if the order of events governed the order of the matter. As it now reads, it is really an exemplification of the confused condition of mind in which the Jews lived; for their history abundantly shows that they strove to satisfy the conditions of the moral law by observing the enactments of the ceremonial law. They were aware that the inside of the cup and platter required to be made clean, but they sought to do so by bestowing care on the outside.

Now that the kingdom of God has been given to the Gentiles, and now that all nations are invited to enter into it, it is above all things necessary that it

should be made to appear, as plainly as it did at first, that the Lord set forth the moral law for *His* people, wherever and in whatever nation such might be found. Those to whom He spake it He called "*My people.*" But the ceremonial law was imposed on those whom the Lord called the people of Moses : "*Thy people, whom thou broughtest up out of the land of Egypt.*" (Exod. xxxii. 7).

Such a view and apprehension of the case justifies the student of the Old Testament in viewing the rule of Levi as an unsubstantial parable, and enables the learner of the will of God to pass directly from the text of the moral law published on Mount Sinai to its exposition and practical application published by our Lord on the Mount of Beatitudes.

## III.

1. Argument in favour of rearranging the book Exodus.—
2. Evidence of disarrangement in it.—3. Its present order injurious to the right understanding of it.—4. No Levitical ordinances till Moses had made a second abode on Mount Sinai.—5. Plea for a better ordering of the book.

1. IF it should ever happen in future ages that a book should be compiled and published in which the history of the ecclesiastical movement in Germany in the sixteenth century was narrated by interpolating the confession of faith exhibited at the Diet of Augsburg with the decrees promulgated at the Council of Trent, the book so published would be, as regards confusion of matter, a counterpart to the present text of the book Exodus; for by a similar confusion of matter the first abode of Moses on Mount Sinai and the eternal moral law then re-enacted, are interpolated with passages describing his second abode on the mount, and the subsequent temporal institutions of the Levitical Code.

Such is the chaotic condition of the text of Exodus, such it had been long before the days of Ezra. Reasons can be offered showing that its disarrangement can be plausibly accounted for; and that its contents have been transposed, not without method. To understand how a disarrangement, destructive of the thread of the narrative and confusing the moral with the ceremonial law, could be tolerated among the ancient Jews requires us to conceive, as well as we can, the condition of the ancient Jews with respect to literature.

For many ages the Jews (Israelites and Hebrews) had no conception of any but one book, the work of Moses, kept in secluded custody by the priests, a book which the people never handled, used, or saw; one, which if they could have read it they could not have understood without the priest's special guidance. Such a society knew nothing either of the original order of matters in the book, or of any subsequent different disposal of the matters. The book Exodus for instance, was of use only to the priest and judge, and it could be the more useful to the priest if the portions referring to his daily ministrations were gathered out from their detached situations, and



copied collectively into a priest's book, Leviticus; to the judge, if particular cases were inserted after the original general law, not in the order of time in which they first arose and were first decided. This supposition accounts for its present unliterary disarrangement, and also to suggest a process by which its original order of matter may be recovered.

The Books of Moses were neither handbooks of morality or of history to the ancient Jews. The priest, when consulted, taught them what was morally right and ceremonially proper. But in their habitual lives they were governed by a folk-lore, consisting not in citations from the Scriptures, but in maxims, spoken of in Scripture as *the proverbs of the ancients* (1 Sam. xxiv. 13); of moral import, as the one cited, *Wickedness proceedeth from the wicked*; or concerning prudence, as the proverb cited by the wise woman of Abel, *they were wont to speak in old time, saying, they shall ask counsel at Abel* (2 Sam. xx. 18).

So in the book Numbers, xxi. 27, *we read, they that speak in proverbs say, &c.*, where the proverb is in the form of a national ballad. Ezekiel even in his days speaks of *every one that useth a proverb*

(xvi. 44), in which place, as in the former, allusion seems made to popular legendary compositions, such as were the book of the wars of the Lord alluded to (Num. xxi. 14) ; or to the legends preserved and repeated by the professional story tellers who exhibited their narrative powers to those who frequented the wells, *at the places of drawing water*, and at the town gates, where they rehearsed the righteous acts of the Lord (Judges v. 11.).

As regards that portion of the folk-lore of the ancient Jews which bore on moral and social life, some of it may have been a residuum of *the wisdom of Egypt* (Acts vii. 22), which their ancestors had known and which had been handed down as household words in families. As regards the legends and ballads of an historical nature, Scripture gives us reasons for knowing that Scripture itself owes nothing to them, but they owe the germs of fact which they contain to facts recorded in Scripture. And notions of their past history, and of the doings of their ancestors, and of the interpositions of the Lord on behalf of their nation, amplified by much detail, more or less true, were widely diffused among the people ; and if they heard the truthful Scripture

narrative from a priest or prophet, they involuntarily interpreted it in the sense of the popular tradition. Every race of men does similarly.

The mere bare truth itself is a plant of very weak vitality on earth, but a truth impregnated by a fiction yields a progeny of legends which are ineradicably vital. No Jew who set himself to interpret the Scriptures as the Alexandrian translator did, could divest his mind altogether of the colouring which legend-lore had given to the Scripture narrative in his eyes, as no mediæval Rabbi could expound Scripture without being biassed by the influence of the Talmud legends, in which probably the ancient legends reappear but in a gross form.

We hear of no public reading of Moses till long after the days of Ezra, when the synagogue appeared in which Moses and the prophets were read; then a book such as Exodus was serviceable for the required reading, whatever order the matter stood in, for the lessons read were but very short extracts; chronological sequence in the narrative was immaterial; and the people knew the law only as altogether ceremonial, so that the amalgamation of a moral law with it was not suspected.

The essentials to an orthodox reading of the Scripture were, that it should be read from the square character, the canonical form of letter, in the Hebrew tongue ; and if so heard, whether interpreted by the synagogue interpreter or not, the Scripture was considered as heard. For the reasons stated, a derangement of the matter in Exodus, or some other book, might exist, and yet remain unknown to the ancient Jews, and unsuspected even by those of more educated and later generations. But if the Jews had known the fact it is extremely probable that the later race of Lawmen would have disposed the matter so as to remedy the disorder. For, judging by the form of the MSS. of the Septuagint, we conclude that the latter portions of the book Exodus, those treating of the tabernacle and its furniture, came into the hands of those translators in a very disordered condition of arrangement ; but when Origen betook himself to edit the Septuagint, he found the Hebrew text at that part in as much order as that which it now exhibits ; and by it, as by a mould, he reduced the Septuagint to the Hebrew order. If the Hebrew text had been in that order in the days of the Septuagint, why did they not follow it ? Why are the Septuagint

MSS. all so confused at the place? Probably in their time it had not been reduced to order, and we may suppose that Hillel or some great master in Israel brought the Hebrew text to the order in which it has ever since stood.

The ancient Jews, unlike the later Rabbin, suffered common sense and the requirements of right reason to direct their labours in copying and preserving the Scriptures.

2. If Moses received instructions to write and publish a law and ordinances on his first abode in the mount, the fact has not been recorded; his breaking of the Tables abrogated his other instructions. But on his second abode on the mount, it is fully recorded (Exod. xxxiv. 10), *Behold, I make a covenant*; the terms are thus summarily stated, One God to be worshipped; idolatry to be extirpated; the Passover, the Sabbath, and the three great festivals of the Jewish year to be observed; and it is added, *Write thou these words, for after the tenor of these words I have made a covenant with thee and with Israel*. And the Apostle to the Hebrews (ix.) having mentioned that the first covenant *had ordinances of divine service and a worldly sanctuary*, says, *when Moses had spoken (or*



written) *every precept to all the people, he took blood and sprinkled the book and all the people* (ver. 19). It is difficult to understand how this can be any other ratification than that which is recorded (Exod. xxiv.). *And Moses wrote all the words of the Lord . . . . and took the book of the covenant, and read it in the ears of the people . . . . and took blood, and sprinkled it on the people, and said, Behold the blood of the covenant, which the Lord hath made with you* (ver. 4, 7, 8.) This must refer to the Lord's words, *write thou these words, for after the tenor of these words I have made a covenant with thee and with Israel*, spoken on Moses' second abode on the Mount (chap. xxxiv. 27); but the writing then commanded and the ratification of the covenant made, are inserted, as the book now stands, among details of his preparation for his *first* ascent into it. Or there must have been two books written of two distinct covenants, that of works, the moral law, and that of ordinances, the law ministered to by Levi. Which it is not unreasonable to suppose. But if so, the two are so intermingled and confused by the present order of the text that they cannot be discerned one from the other, a confusion most in-



jurious to those who would apprehend the Divine dispensations.

Our Lord approved the saying that the observance of the moral law was better than all whole burnt offerings and sacrifices: and the prophets and inspired men laboured to live in the moral law, and to impress it as what the Lord required (Micah vi. 8); we read that *to obey is better than sacrifice*, and David says, *thou requirest no sacrifice*—the sacrifices of God are a broken spirit, *i.e.* human wilfulness subdued to the will of God.

As the book Exodus is now ordered, we are required to believe that Moses wrote the Book of the Covenant before he had been commanded to do so; but wrote none after he had been instructed to do it.

We also notice that after Moses came down from his second abode on the mount, with commandment to publish the covenant then made, the narrative in its present order fitly describes the appearance of Moses, his calling the people to him, his gathering all the congregation and saying unto them, *These are the words that the Lord hath commanded, that ye should do them* (xxxv. 1), where we should naturally expect to find the terms of the covenant detailed; but

if we would discover them, we must look elsewhere, and pick them up in fragments here and there, for nothing follows the solemn exordium above cited except a ceremonial injunction to kindle no fire in houses on the Sabbath ; a sequel hardly *dignum tanto hiatu*.

The first four Books of Moses are one continuous volume ; there is no break in narrative or in diction between Genesis and Exodus, or between Exodus and Leviticus, only at the Book of Numbers the subject passes from the statutes of religion to the taking of a census of the people. Patriarchal sacrifices continue till the covenant is ratified, the blood sprinkled on the book was from a sacrifice of the Patriarchal, not of the Levitical manner and order. Levi is put into office, and consequently in the book Deuteronomy, written about forty years after, we find the priests the sons of Levi, the Levites, mentioned as keepers of the sacred records (Deut. xxxi. 9).

Moses, who, before he had been called and inspired, *was not eloquent, but slow of speech and of a slow tongue* (Exod. iv. 10), after the Lord had been forty years with his mouth, teaching him what to

say (Exod. iv. 12), had come to <sup>4\*</sup>surpass in eloquence all who ever spoke ; at the time when he wrote what we read in Deuteronomy ; for there is no written language so sublime, powerful, and pathetic as the language of Moses in that book ; and yet the reader is compelled to acknowledge that it is the same man who had witnessed, suffered, and recorded all that is recorded in the preceding books.

As regards the first four books, they have been most uncritically and mechanically divided, especially the first three, with the same disregard to continuity as is apparent in the division of the matter into chapters. But this, though an unhappiness, is not the positive evil caused in the book Exodus, by the confusion of the record of the Lord's dealing with those whom he spoke of to Moses as *my people*, with the same when he had degraded them so that he recognised them only as *thy people*, when he spoke of them to Moses ; and by the uncertain ordering of the various paragraphs, so that the reader cannot know whether he is to refer what is recorded to the first or to the second visit of Moses to Mount Sinai. The texture of the book is like that of a *garment mingled of linen and woollen*, its surface is a *field sown with mingled seed*.

Before it is condemned as a most presumptuous, if not sacrilegious act to dismember and rearrange the text of Exodus, it must be borne in mind that no omission nor change of a letter even is contemplated; that the Church itself cannot affirm that we have the book in the order in which Moses disposed its contents; that it has been at the mercy of a priesthood who misunderstood its purport as much as they revered its materials; that the understanding of it has been reserved to the Church (1 St. Peter i. 12); that the claims of a better knowledge of its language have been admitted as justifying a better translation of its text, and that therefore an Evangelical conception of its purport and of the dispensations of the Lord in instructing and dealing with his people has claims to be heard, when it is proposed to set forth the book of the law in an order symmetrical with the doctrines of the Church respecting the moral, the Levitical, and the social ceremonial laws. Had this been done at first, the Church would have been spared many confusions.

The work is not suggested as a method of conciliating the opponents of mysteries by yielding part of their demands, which would be a hopeless and wicked

attempt ; but by lawfully setting forth the book in a form more like its primitive order ; *to set up the bulwarks of Zion*, and render her less easily assailable. Nor is it supposed that the work, if done, would make Scripture a narrative merely for the understanding by removing any mysteries requiring faith. All who are conversant with elucidations of Scripture know, that what is most clearly elucidated by sober study has a mystery in every saying in it.

If it can be shown that its original order has been disarranged, and that by such disarrangement the reader is exposed seriously to misconceive the dispensations of the Lord, even if no account can be given of the causes of such dislocation of passages, the Church, when retranslating, can hardly justify herself for permitting the text to go forth again in its present order. If it can be shown that in places the original order of the text has been changed into another, to serve some temporary useful purpose, that purpose being known, a solution of the difficulty is found, and the way to recovering the original order is indicated.

As an instance of a disarrangement of matter evident from the context and injurious to the mean-



ing of the record, a passage may be found, Exod. xxiv. 4, 7, 8. We there read that *the Lord said unto Moses, come thou up, &c.*, and *Moses wrote all the words of the Lord, and read the book in the audience of the people, and took blood and sprinkled it on the people, and on the book* (Heb. ix. 19). *Then went Moses up, &c.*

A marginal note in Matthew Parker's Bible shows that the author of the version perceived a palpable dehiscence and consequent want of connection in the text at this place (Exod. xxiv. 1); accordingly the passage is made to say, *The Lord had said unto Moses, come up, &c.*, instead of *the Lord said*, and the note explains that it was said when the Lord had ended speaking the commandments (chap. xx.). This is the true solution of the difficulty, and its practical remedy is the removal of the interposed matter to its proper place. The Hebrew verb is not in a state to justify its being translated *had said*, though the English version has so translated it (Gen. xii. 1).\*

\* An unhappy effect of substituting a pluperfect for a perfect tense occurs in Isaiah xxvi. 15. "Thou hast increased the nation, thou art glorified, thou *hadst* removed it far away *unto* the ends of the earth." The Hebrew seems to say, *Thou hast added to the nation, thou hast set back every boundary of the land*, that is to say, enlarged its dwelling-place. See Isaiah liv. 2.



If we accept the present order of the text as original, and as the order of events, then we must believe that we are told in Scripture that Moses taught the law before he had been taught by the Lord; wrote it before he had been commanded to do so; and ratified it before ever he had been into the mountain; before he had received the first tables written by the Lord Himself. For *then*, says the English text, *then went Moses up*, and he returns with the first tables of the law in the 32nd chapter. The note of time *then*, as though it was *not until then*, is a gratuitous insertion by the authors of the English version; there is no mark of time in the Hebrew, nor in the Septuagint, nor in the Vulgate, but translators must have supplied it, pressed by the manifest want of continuity in the text before them.

Scripture, no doubt, abounds in dark sayings and in mysteries hard to be understood, and it would be mere arrogancy to alter a saying, dark to us, so as to bring it within the reach of our understanding. But a mystery is not confusion, nor is it a thing without form, but some parts of the Book of Exodus, like many others, are confused and without form, and need the Spirit to make them into shape.

3. The imperfection of its present arrangement is not like that, sometimes unavoidable in narrative, caused by the anticipating a subsequent event; for the dislocation of passages under consideration actually dates the ratification of the ceremonial law as having taken place before the moral law had been given. The result to the reader has been that the ceremonial law has been made part of the moral law; and the dealings of the Almighty with the people, after they had preferred the golden calf to the Lord, are mixed up with his dealings with the people, while as yet they had not broken his covenant. It is as if the account of Adam's disobedience was set before the command given him to dress and keep the garden.

In the case of a manifest displacement of passages, destructive of the order of the narrative, and injurious to the meaning of Scripture, it seems unreasonable to say that the reverence due to Scripture forbids the alteration required; for it is not the intention of the Spirit which dictated the Scriptures to put stumbling-blocks in the way of the wayfaring man. It is, on the contrary, distinctly promised by the Spirit that when that *light that lighteth every man*

*who cometh into the world should have come, there shall be a highway and a way, called the way of holiness, such that wayfaring men, though fools, shall not err therein* (Is. xxxv. 8).

But if by reverence for Scripture is meant reverence for that arrangement of the letter and text in which the Jews arranged it; such reverence is rather comparable to the superstitious regard of the Rabbin for special forms for particular letters; they believed that the casual distortion of a letter in the text was given to it by inspiration, and that it indicated a mystery; and where an essential letter has manifestly been omitted or altered by a lapse of the copyist, refused ever to readmit it into the *ketib*, the written text, but allowed it to be sounded in the *qeri*, or text as read.

In the rearrangement of the text contemplated as *re-editing* of it, no alteration or omission of one jot or tittle is contemplated; but only such transpositions of paragraphs as the sense and doctrine both require, and which the grammar of the original Hebrew allows, if it does not suggest, and which the context loudly demands.

The doctrine, or rather the fact, necessitating

a new arrangement of the contents of the book Exodus is, that the moral law must be kept distinct from and free from admixture with the ceremonial law ; consequently, the first abode of Moses on the mount, must be kept separate from his second admission to it, in the narrative. Scripture supplies us with abundant evidence enabling us to discern what belongs to the moral law, first given, and what belongs to the ceremonial law afterwards instituted, and by this information we can sift out the one from the other. The Lord draws the distinction between the moral law and the ceremonial law, showing that the difference between them was priority of institution and absence of ordinances in the moral law, as we read *I spake not unto your fathers nor commanded them, in the day that I brought them out of the land of Egypt, concerning burnt offerings or sacrifices : but this thing commanded I them, saying, Obey my voice, and I will be your God, and ye shall be my people ; and walk ye in all the ways that I have commanded you* (Jer. vii. 22, 23).

If this place in Scripture is well weighed, it will appear that the argument is, that an observance of the ceremonial law profited nothing if the moral law

was not observed. One observance was that burnt offerings might not be eaten, as peace offerings might ; but the Lord tells the people that if they did not walk in the ways which He commanded, it mattered little or nothing whether they strictly observed such an ordinance of the ceremonial or not. Therefore, the Lord saith, *Put your burnt offerings unto your sacrifices* (peace offerings) *and eat the flesh* of both alike (ver. 22) ; for they were a nation that obeyed not the voice of the Lord (ver. 28) ; the *voice of the Lord* being the commandments which He had spoken *with a loud voice*.

The Lord, by saying that if they walked in all the ways that He commanded them, *it should be well with them*, intimated that they would not then have needed the imposition of a ceremonial law upon them, but that their idolatrous worship of the golden calf had rendered the yoke of ceremonies necessary to curb and control them.

The Lord, indeed, on Mount Sinai recalled the people to the faith and practice of Abraham ; confirming to them the promise He had made to Abraham ; but adding the moral law, because in Egypt they had indulged in an abundance of evil



habits, contrary to the principles of Abraham's faith ; the moral law, therefore, was added *that sin might abound*, as St. Paul technically expressed the purpose it served ; for it served to show the people that their habits abounded in sins which he forbade.

4. But the Levitical priesthood, burnt offerings and peace offerings, are unknown to that moral law, and had no place in it. Worship by sacrifice dated from the gates of Paradise. The Passover had been instituted already in Egypt. It and circumcision are neither of them Levitical. The moral law needed not to rehearse these, they were left as they had been. Whatever sacrifices were performed at the foot of Mount Sinai, were not administered to by Levi. Aaron does not appear as a priest, nor the tribe of Levi as sacerdotal, till the second tables of the law had been brought down from the mount and put into the ark ; *I put the tables in the ark which I had made*, saith Moses (Deut. x. 5). *At that time the Lord separated the tribe of Levi, to bear the ark, to stand before the Lord to minister unto Him, and to bless in his name* (ver. 8).

We read, ver. 9, that Levi received this office *according as the Lord promised him* ; but the Hebrew

has *spoke*, not *promised*, as the *Lord spoke* (to me) concerning him, *diber lo, lo* here means concerning him as *lak* is concerning thee (Ps. xci. 11), *περὶ σοῦ* (Mat. iv. 6); for we do not read that the Lord ever spoke to Levi, but that He spoke to Moses those things which concerned Levi.

The words *When Israel went out of Egypt, Judah was His sanctuary* (Ps. cxiv.) may possibly intimate that the priesthood was in Judah at that period and until Levi was put into office; whence we may conclude that the *young men of the children of Israel*, who ministered at the sacrifice which Moses offered at the foot of Mount Sinai, were of the tribe of Judah.\*

\* St. Paul tells us that Moses did not speak anything concerning Judah as a sacerdotal tribe, he does not say that Jacob did not when he prophesied that the sceptre and the lawgiver should be in Judah (Gen. xlix. 10).

Jacob deprived Reuben of supremacy, set aside Simeon and Levi for their treachery and cruelty, and set up Judah to receive the praise of his brethren; giving that tribe the sceptre until some event happened; until *Shiloh comes*, which has been understood to mean *until Christ comes*, but not by the most ancient translators; nor do the Evangelists or Prophets ever claim Jacob's words as prophetic of Christ, though the Apostle could hardly have missed doing so when he wrote *it is evident that our Lord sprang out of*

In the text, *Judah was his sanctuary*, the Hebrew copula, *was*, is so written as to require a feminine nominative, and Judah is masculine, whence some have concluded that *daughter of Judah* is meant, and that the words have reference to the mother of our *Judah* (Heb. vii. 14); and it is undeniable that the sceptre, instead of departing from the tribe of Judah, returned to that tribe in the person of our Lord the King of the Jews.

*What is appointed for him*, the Septuagint translation of *Shiloh*, seems to have been the accepted, and to be the true translation; the Chaldee Targumist does not translate *Shiloh* by *Messiah*, as it is sometimes said, but paraphrases the passage as follows, *till Messiah comes whose the kingdom is*, where *Shiloh* seems represented by *whose is*, and *Messiah* and *the Kingdom* (words nowhere in the Hebrew) seem interpolated as explanatory. Our Lord's descent through Judah is not affected by the prophecy; the Gospel makes our Lord the son of David, who was of the tribe of Judah. It is not to be supposed that the Israelites in Egypt had no priesthood and rites among them, however corrupt these may have become.

The Egyptians indeed would not tolerate the sacrificing of oxen, owing to their reverence for the Ox-god, Apis (Exod. viii. 26): but lambs may have been offered in sacrifice in Egypt. The killing of the lamb for the first Passover seems to have given no offence to the Egyptians. Sacrifices infer a priesthood.

Jacob's prophecy may reasonably be understood as pointing to the deliverance of the people out of Egypt by the expression *what is appointed for them*; for when Moses, of the tribe of Levi, was made the lawgiver, the lawgiver certainly was no longer to be found in the tribe of Judah. Though until then it may have been so, it then departed from Judah.

Lord. The expression *daughter of Judah* occurs in Lamentations, where it means the tribe or congregation of Judah.

5. The sum of the preceding arguments is, that Levi and the ceremonies of the law had no place till after that Moses had been called up into the mount the second time, and having returned from it, appointed Aaron High Priest, and the Levites priests, and ordered the Tabernacle according to a pattern which had been shown him on the mount, not during his *first*, but during his *second* forty days' abode on it.

This conclusion would be obvious were it not that the text of Exodus is now so arranged that many precepts of the ceremonial law appear from it as if delivered immediately after the ten commandments, from Mount Sinai; as any one may see who will read the 20th and two following chapters consecutively. Yet Moses distinctly tells us that when the Lord had spoken the ten words, commandments, *he added no more*; as it is said elsewhere, he spake nothing concerning burnt offerings and peace offerings.

The ten commandments, the moral law, having been spoken by the Lord, Moses was immediately called

up into Mount Sinai to receive them in writing on stone slabs, and came back after forty days, only to break the tables to pieces, signifying that the dispensation of that moral law could not be ratified, the people having revoked their pledge to serve the True God by adopting the golden calf as the image of their god.

This moral law covenant was not ratified by the sprinkling of blood on the stone tables of its terms, either then or ever, until it was ratified by the sprinkling of the blood of Jesus, not on tables of stone, but on the fleshly tables of men's hearts, on which the Lord writes it (2 Cor. iii. 3). Not that it was abrogated, but it was deferred as to its full publication, till One should come who would fulfil it: and the instruction as to its methods which Moses received during his first abode in Sinai was not disclosed to men in its fulness and spiritual import till Christ *opened his mouth* and taught it on the Hill of Beatitudes in the sermon on the mount.

Yet flashes of its true light broke out at times from inspired lips, as from Samuel's, in the words *To obey is better than sacrifice*, and from David's *Thou requirest no sacrifice*; that is to say, not such as



Levi offered, *which can never take away sins* (Heb. x. 11).

We observe also that those solemn sacrifices, such as Samuel offered in Gilgal, David at Araunah's threshing floor, and Elijah on Mount Carmel, were of the Patriarchal, not of the Levitical type and order. Thus ever the *Old Paths* and the *Moral Law* come to light in precept and practice at times, among those who apprehended their universal and unchangeable spirit, and anticipated the day when the Lord should say, *Neither on this mountain exclusively, nor at Jerusalem exclusively, shall men worship the Father.* It was this moral law which our Lord came to fulfil; our Lord ignored Levi altogether as one whose ordinances He came to fulfil. He declared that duty towards God and one's neighbour was the matter and theme of the law and the prophets which He came to fulfil; and the whole teaching of the prophets is directed to enforcing the moral, not the ceremonial law.

Since such is the eminence and separate dignity of the law given on Mount Sinai on the first abode of Moses on the Mount; such its distinctive and separate dignity should surely not be suffered to lie

buried beneath Levitical precepts, and encumbered by the provisions of the ceremonial law on the pages of Exodus, as now it is. It is principally owing to this confusion that the ministers of Christ's Church waver between breaking of bread as the apostles did, and offering sacrifice as Levi did, when they stand at the altar.

If any are disposed to object that the Church, in exercising her authority by setting forth a Bible in which passages are removed from their present places to others, giving a rearranged text, might expose herself to the charge of disposing texts so as to favour and support any particular doctrine, a little reflection will show that there are no grounds for such apprehension; for the Church, in interpreting, is bound by the Gospel and the Creed; as in translating, by the language and the grammar; and in rearranging the order of passages, by the syntax and context. Articles of belief are not dependent on the context of passages, but every one of them is like the substance of one of the commandments, a distinct proposition, unaffected by the context, except so far as illustration or expansion is concerned.

The rearranging of the text of the Old Testament is advocated, not in the interests of controversies between Churches, but for the credit of the books in the eyes of those who look on them as literature, and therefore require in them the usual formal features of literary works. Their essential and distinctive qualities would not suffer by their being edited on the same principles of criticism as are applied to the editing of any ancient writings. Since improved knowledge of language is considered to justify their retranslation, it would seem reasonable to argue that the present equally advanced science of criticism justifies the re-editing of them, or rather a practical editing of their contents.

## IV.

1. The book Exodus probably transposed by the ancient Jews.—
2. Their reasons for transposing its contents—Original order recoverable.—3. Its desirableness.—4. Confusing effect of its present arrangement.

1. IF it is objected that the known aversion of the Jews from altering the shape even of a letter in the text must much more have deterred them from altering the sequence of passages in it; it may reasonably be answered that the Rabbinical scrupulousness with respect to the form of the letter is of comparatively recent date.

Such servile worship of the text, which made them respect and honour even the palpable lapses of the pen of some former scribe, must have originated in days when the copyist, who transcribed the text, had to reproduce a language which he hardly understood, and a type not of common use.

Such a copyist would rather be more accurate than

one who, whilst copying, mentally criticised the work he was transcribing. We copy an inscription of which we know the language, without regard to the form of the letter: of an inscription in an unknown tongue we make, not a copy but a fac-simile. So that the later imperfect knowledge of the Hebrew language among the Jews has actually favoured the exact reproduction of old rolls of Scripture.

But, originally and anciently, the text of Scripture was handled more rationally and profitably. In carrying out the directions given (Deut. vi. 9) about writing the ten commandments on the posts of the house, and on the town gates, the Jews appear often to have added portions of texts from various parts of Scripture. So, at least, they appear on the fragment of a limestone slab (now in the Leeds Museum), on which, after the commandments, of which the last four in their abbreviated form are still legible, there follow the words—

*Thou shalt build there an altar.* (Deut. xxvii. 6.)

*Thou shalt write on stones all the words of this law* (ver. 8); and another line in which the word *Moses* only is perfectly legible. These latter lines on the slab show that Scripture could be lawfully



transposed for grave and profitable purposes.\* The terms of the statute quoted, *thou shalt write all the words of this law*, mean all the commandments, which were called *the ten words*, and are probably these—

I. I am the Lord thy God that brought thee out of the land of Egypt.

II. Thou shalt have none other gods before Me.

III. Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in vain.

IV. Remember the Sabbath-day to keep it holy.

V. Honour thy father and thy mother.

VI. Thou shalt not kill.

VII. Thou shalt not commit adultery.

VIII. Thou shalt not steal.

IX. Thou shalt not bear false witness.

X. Thou shalt not covet.

If the concise form in which they sometimes

\* The slab in question was found at Nablous of the Samaritans, near Mount Gerizim, where *Joshua wrote upon the stones a copy of the law of Moses* (Josh. viii. 32), words which must imply the ten commandments. The claims which Jewish written commentaries have to our consideration may be estimated by the comment on this place, which informs us that Joshua engraved on stones the whole five Books of Moses in seventy different languages.

appear written is indeed all of the commandments, it follows that in the form in which some of them appear in Exodus we have the actual commandment, and also an expansion of it inserted as assigning a cause for the commandment, or as applying its general law to particular cases.

This opinion accounts for the fact that in the copy of the fourth commandment, in Deuteronomy, a reason for the sanctification of the Sabbath is given different from that assigned in the copy of the same commandment in Exodus.

When the Lord spoke the commandment, He could not have spoken it in both forms; if He spoke it in either form, it could not possibly have been altered; we cannot suppose the one form was on the first tables, the other on the second. The only conclusion seems to be, that the reasons assigned for the sanctification of the Sabbath were no part of what God spoke or wrote, but that the Lord said merely *Remember the Sabbath-day to keep it holy*; and that what follows has been usefully inserted as an inspired expansion and application of the commandment.

The same argument may reasonably be used with

reference to the detail of things not to be carved or graven for worship. . .

That the matter, usually ranking as the second commandment, was not one of the ten precepts spoken by the Lord may be inferred from our finding that Moses, in exhorting the people to abstain from image worship, does not cite words from the Lord, heard by them, forbidding it, but argues against it from the fact that they had not seen any similitude on the day when the Lord spoke to them (Deut. iv. 15); and thence forbids their attempting to invent any likeness under which to worship the Lord.

Images were not offensive in the Temple nor perilous to the faith, unless placed, *a desolating abomination*, at the place of prostration *before the Lord*; hence, neither the cherubim over the mercy seat, nor the oxen supporting the great laver were objectionable; no Jew could conceive of any one worshipping except at the one appointed place. Prayer was made everywhere by the devout with the face turned towards the veil; but worship, prostration, before the sanctuary veil, was distinct from the act of prayer; it was required to be performed three times a year in acknowledgment

of the Lord; it was the act of homage exacted of every Israelite.

2. As soon as we discover evidences that such a book as Exodus is lying before us in a disjointed state, events which followed made to precede, and effects stated before their causes appear, through a dislocation of the matters in the book; we first desire to ascertain whether any sufficient reason can be assigned for the ancient copyists having so disarranged the normal order of the matter in it.

We arrive at the reason by reflecting that Ezra could not have transcribed from the autograph of Moses. If the book of the law which Hilkiah found in the Temple, to his amazement, in the days of Josiah, was the autograph, we cannot reasonably suppose that it survived and was carried to Babylon and brought back.

We know, however, that from early times—at least, in the days of the early kings—the judges who went their circuits carried a book of the law with them. These books must have been compiled from the Temple roll originally; and the priests in the Temple required copies for their use in putting the law into practice, and in deciding cases. If we

carefully inspect Exodus in its present form, what first strikes us is, that the ten commandments are immediately followed by cases decided on points raised by each commandment.

We see that the historical chronological order of events is interrupted, and cases on the law are interpolated between the publishing of the commandments orally by the Lord, and the delivery of them in writing on the tables of stones. This arrangement is the one which would naturally be selected and adopted by a judge for his own use in deciding questions relative to cases not provided for by the letter of the commandment, but to be decided in the spirit of it. And these sets of cases are headed by the words, *the Lord said unto Moses*, because they were cases brought before Moses, and by him laid before the Lord who knew Moses *face to face*, which means, *admitted him to audience*, and gave him instructions, as a king instructs his officer of state.

This hypothesis of a systematic digest of statutes in Exodus is confirmed by our perceiving that cases decided have been arranged with some regard to the order of the commandments, according as they supplemented the particular commandment.



For instance, the first precept being *thou shalt have no other gods before me, i.e.* no idols at the place where I am worshipped, the first supplementary ordinance, inserted immediately after the complete series of the commandments, forbids the placing of silver and gold images at the place of worship; the next describes the manner of altar to be made there (Exod. xx. 23, 24).

The fourth commandment having mentioned menservants and maidservants, there then follow cases determined respecting male and female servants. The sixth commandment is then explained as to what is to be considered murder. The fifth, directing honour to parents, is next supplemented by the addition of the punishment to be inflicted on him who curseth father or mother.

This arrangement is evidently so obviously adapted to the use of him who had to expound and exemplify the moral law, that it seems most reasonable to conclude that the book would be arranged for use on some such principle. If so, then it has not been by chance that the book presents the original matter in a dislocated form.

If the matter of the law is to be rearranged, it

must be done in accordance with the principle of removing subsequent supplementary statutes from intermixture with the original primary commandments, an ancient disarrangement, also made on a principle, not by accident, but with the commendable object of making the law of ready access and reference to those who had to apply it.

If the text has been so dealt with by the ancient Jewish Church, as in the preceding arguments it has been supposed to have done, it certainly can be no irreverence to the text, nor unprecedented liberty taken with it, if the Church of Christ should put back into its original form the matter of the Book of Exodus; that, having served, in its present form, those who lived under the Levitical dispensation, it may return to that form in which it best serves those who live under the Gospel moral law, offering them true doctrine most directly.

It would not suit the limits of the present essays to sketch out a rearrangement of the whole Book of Exodus; what is now urged and contemplated will be sufficiently shown by bringing together into right sequence the narrative of the first ascent of Moses into Mount Sinai.

*According to Deuteronomy, v. 22 : The Lord, having spoken the ten commandments, added no more ; and the people being terrified and promising to obey the law, Moses reported their fear and promise to the Lord, who dismissed the people from attendance, but called Moses to him to be taught. Hence, after Exod. xx. 17, we next recover the narrative at Exod. xxiv. 1. And he said unto Moses, come up unto the Lord, thou, and Nadab and Abihu, and seventy of the elders of Israel, and worship ye afar off. Ver. 2 (said to the elders and others) : And Moses alone shall come near unto the Lord, but they shall not come nigh ; neither shall the people go up with him. Omitting what intervenes, we go forward to ver. 9. Then went up Moses, and Aaron, Nadab and Abihu, and seventy of the elders of Israel : and they saw the God of Israel : and there was under his feet as it were a paved work of a sapphire stone, and as it were the body of heaven in its clearness. And upon the nobles of the children of Israel he laid not his hand (i.e. did not smite them) : also they saw God, and did eat and drink (i.e. lived after having seen him). And the Lord said unto Moses, come up unto me in the mount, and be there : and I will give thee tables of stone, and a*

law, and commandments which I have written ; that thou mayest teach them, &c., *to ver. 18, to the words*, Moses was in the mount forty days and forty nights. *Passing over interpolations, we go forward to* Exod. xxxi. 18. And He gave unto Moses, when He had made an end of communing with him on Mount Sinai, two tables of testimony, tables of stone, written with the finger of God ; c. xxxii. 1. And when the people saw that Moses delayed to come down out of the mount, the people gathered themselves together unto Aaron, and said to him, Make us gods, which shall go before us, &c. ; *and the narrative proceeds, as in the printed Bibles, to the end of c. xxxii.*

The above is the orderly narrative of the circumstances attending the audible publication of the ten commandments by the Lord, the first abode of Moses on the mount, the delivery of the law written by the finger of God on two tables of stone, and the breaking of those tables.

All else that appears in Bibles, interpolated here and there into the narrative, belongs to events subsequent to the second abode of Moses on the mount, that is, to the Levitical law given on that occasion.

It was during his *second* abode on the mount that the pattern of things ecclesiastical was shown to Moses.

3. When it is proposed to remove bodily from their present place such large portions of the Book of Exodus as the whole 21st, 22nd and 23rd chapters, it becomes necessary to find the place in which they can be inserted as consistently as they can be removed from their present place.

As the context of the book and sequence of the narrative indicate their present misplacement, so they also indicate their proper original locality in the book. There is a distinct heading and preface (Exod. xxxiv. 29) to a narrative of all that had been taught and authorised on the occasion of the second abode of Moses on Mount Sinai; and, if the order of the narrative and dispensations is of importance, to this place they should be removed as having been their original position.

(Exod. xxxiv. 29). *It came to pass, when Moses came down from Mount Sinai, &c. ; Aaron and all the rulers of the congregation returned unto him, &c. ; and afterwards all the children of Israel came nigh, &c. ; and Moses gathered all the congregation of the*



*children of Israel together, and said unto them, These are the words which the Lord hath commanded that ye should do then.*

At this place must have followed, in the original rolls, the statutes and ordinances commanded ; but in the present arrangement nothing follows but a particular precept about not kindling a fire on the Sabbath day. And from this place the several precepts have been extracted, to be inserted as we find them, where each was of readiest reference for application in dealing with cases arising out of the general law of the commandments. Here, also, after this series of ordinances, must have followed the narrative of the sacrifice offered *by young men of the children of Israel*, commissioned by Moses, with the blood of which sacrifice the people and the book were sprinkled (Exod. xxiv. 4) ; and the calling of the tribe of Levi to the priesthood (Exod. xxviii. 1 ; Deut. x. 8).

Thus, when the light of the Spirit of the Gospel is commanded to shine on the chaos to which the book has been reduced by the hands of Levi, it takes form and order of itself.

The broad distinction between the original moral

law and the dispensation combining the moral law with ceremonies, entirely unperceived by the Jewish people, but clearly revealed by the Gospel light, may be apprehended by understanding that the Lord on Mount Sinai met his people as a father his children, *Out of Egypt have I called MY SON* (Hos. xi. 1). Then God himself *shone forth on them from Paran*. Light and truth were offered them directly from the Lord.

After the tables had been broken, and Moses had returned from his second abode on Mount Sinai, only *the face of Moses* shone on them, not the light of God's countenance; they then received light and instruction, *urim* and *thummin*, from the priest. They became not sons, but servants (Lev. xxv. 55). When Christ came, then again men *saw the glory of God in the face* (person) *of Jesus Christ* (2 Cor. iv. 6).

The popular notion of the Almighty who spoke from Sinai, is simply the Manichæan view, as in the hymn—

“When God of old came down from heaven,  
In power and *wrath* He came.”

#### 4. The overlapping of two phases of divine

dispensation is the impediment to a profitable understanding of the book Exodus in its present arrangement; tainting the eternal moral law with the temporary Levitical ordinances, associating Melchisedek with Levi, and making the shadow part of the substance; a rearrangement of the matter of the book is demanded as a duty to the people, and the Church alone has the spirit of wisdom enabling the doing of it by her.

This confusion of the Levitical with the moral dispensation has given Levi a voice in ordering things in the Church of Christ, whereas Melchisedek is her pattern, and the spiritual sacrifice at the Christian altar ought to reflect the ante-Levitical Passover. The confusion has arisen from the want of a marked boundary-line separating the scope and extent of Moses's first abode on the mount, and the instructions which he then received, from the scope and extent of his second abode on the mount, and the narrative of the pattern of ceremonial things then shown to him.

Whatever spiritual instructions Moses received on the occasion of his first abode on Mount Sinai, no direct and formal publication of them was ever made

by him ; when he broke the tables, the very germ of the law of holiness was checked in its growth, and never grew so as to overshadow the people with the wings of the Almighty. They lived under the shadow of death, that is, of the Levitical ordinances, *which could never give life.*

It was not until He who spoke to Moses on Mount Sinai, stood on the Mount of Beatitudes and spoke the sermon on the mount, that men heard orderly and distinctly the actual meaning of the ten commandments, and the manner in which the spirit of them was to be kept. For the Mount of the Sermon is the Sinai of the Church of Christ. Our Lord rehearsed the commandments in the letter, *Ye have heard that it was said by them of old time, Thou shalt not kill ;* and gave the meaning, the spirit, *but I say unto you, That whosoever is angry with his brother without a cause shall be in danger of the judgment* (Mat. v.).

Our Lord did not come to fulfil the Levitical, but the eternal law ; He, as it were, took up and restored the tables that fell from the hands of Moses and were broken, and resumed the dispensation of grace at the point where it had been suspended on the idolatry of

the Israelites before the golden calf. He carried the thoughts of men back beyond Levi's days to the faith in which Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob lived. As man, He died by the hands of Levi, a martyr to the truth of the eternal moral law, protesting against the reality of the ceremonial law. The sacrifice of his death is distinctly pointed out as a sacrifice of a type more ancient than Levi; his death being likened to the sacrifice of the Passover lamb in Egypt by the circumstances noted that *they brake not his bones*. Nor did the ministrations of Levi supply one feature to the Christian Passover which he instituted, He, Himself, being the lamb slain, not from the day of Levi's consecration only, but, figuratively, in every lawful sacrifice from the days of Adam.

The learned men who are now labouring to improve the authorised English version of the Bible, are dealing with a version which has influenced mankind more widely than the Vulgate, and which has had no rival in power and effect on men, except it be the Greek Alexandrian version by the Seventy. If the Church of England will charge them to re-edit the Old Testament, by restoring, as far as possible, every passage to that place which it re-



quires, in order that the sequence of matter may be also the sequence of doctrine, though they might not in some places succeed in replacing the text in the form in which it left the author's hand, yet they could not fail to produce a Bible such that it would surpass in excellence of workmanship the rehabilitated rolls of Ezra. And, by their labours, the Church would at last, and for the first time, read the Scriptures without having her mouth bridled by the bridle of the Jews; and would no longer measure out the Scriptures to her people with the homer and hin of Levi.

## V.

1. Proposed revision of the authorised version.—2. Jewish interpretations not to be implicitly trusted.—3. Jewish misconceptions as to the visitation of a father's iniquity on his children.—4. Decadence and revival of the knowledge of Hebrew.

1. THE sound mind of the primitive Church considered that the Scriptures were intended for divulgation amongst all believers in the language which every communion spoke. Hence, the Syriac Church secured to her people, in the apostolic age, or soon after, the Scriptures in the Syriac language of the Peshito version. The Chaldee Targums led the way. The Latin version must have appeared in the second century, and, as being understood by the people, soon supplanted the Greek version in Italy; St. Paul's Epistle to the Church at Rome in the Greek language, among other causes, having made the Greek the canonical language at first of the

Church at Rome. In the fourth century, Ulphilas, by his Mæso-Gothic version, sanctified a barbarous tongue by translating into it those Scriptures which a Christian Rabbinism suggested were to be written only in one or other of those three languages in which our Lord's offence was inscribed on the cross by Pilate. The historian, Socrates, taunts Ulphilas for having translated the Scriptures into the language of chapmen, *ψαθυροπώλαι*; but it is his glory. The Church of England, above all other Churches, has made it part of her vocation to translate the Scriptures, not only into her own language, but into that of every nation to which her people have access; and in so doing has vindicated and exemplified her true catholicity.

The suggestion emanating from the Episcopal Church in America, that no alteration should be made in the authorised English version of the Holy Scriptures, without consultation with all parties concerned, that is to say, with all of the Anglican race in any part of the world who are in communion with the See of Canterbury, justifies the opinion, held already by some, that the consent of the Church of England to a revision of her authorised text of

the Scriptures was of far wider import than it may have seemed to be to others.

Taken in connection with other significant indications in Christianity at large, it appears every day more and more to be a symptom of an approaching movement among Christians as important as was the Reformation.

If such a movement is approaching, no temporising will avert it; and, if it is to be prepared for and guided, moulded and sobered, it must be by the active exertions of the Church of England, which is the heart to the pulses which beat in the Anglican communion in the ends of the earth.

The Church in England prospered better in her reformation of herself than the Christians in Germany and Switzerland did in reforming their tenets; because, in England, the reformatory process was worked by the Church, but, abroad, by the people. This is an instructive fact, as teaching the Church in England to lead the way, and direct the progress of any movement which may be impending.

It is useful also to remember that it was by the labours of Erasmus, in purifying the current version of the New Testament, that the Reformation was

furnished with a better exposition of the mind of Evangelists and Apostles, as a justification of its fundamental assertion, that the shackles, which had been riveted on the souls and minds of men, were not that yoke of Christ which brings unbridled nature into subjection to the Spirit, as the Church of Rome asserted them to be, but fetters which impeded the growth of healthy religion and of the reasonable intellect.

Until then, mental and spiritual bondage had been justified out of the New Testament, not by altering the original so as to make it serve the purpose, but by the sleight of hand of the interpreter, who superinduced over the original a meaning which it never intended to give; transmuting, for instance, *μετάνοια* into *penance*. The distinction between penance and repentance had been well pointed out by Maimonides, on the repentance of the Ninevites (Jonah iii. 10). "It is not said, God saw their sackcloth and fasting, but, God saw their works."

What was then done as to the New Testament, in the way of vindicating its original from interested translators, was not then done, nor ever has since been done, as to the Old Testament, so as to vindi-



cate its original from prejudiced Jewish translators.

Consequently, it is still exhibited in that fashion and with that meaning which the Jews chose to discern in it, because it was one which gratified their conceits. For, though the compilers of the English version confronted, as St. Jerome did, the Septuagint with the Hebrew, they yet embodied, without modification, into their version, the views and opinions of the Septuagint on all the legislation and transactions recorded in the Old Testament. And, since the views of the Septuagint are the views taken by the Jews three hundred years before Christ, the Church still borrows the key of the Rabbi for admission into the mysteries of the law, not the key of David (Rev. iii. 7), except in those cases where Christ or his Apostles have opened for her.

The fetters which galled men's minds before the Reformation, gall them no more; but many will no longer submit to be bound by an imposed interpretation of the Old Testament which represents the Lord as commanding in its days what He forbade in the days of the Gospel. Men rise half inspired

from the perusal of the Gospel, and cannot identify the Lord who wept at the very thought of the destruction of Jerusalem, with the Lord who, as the Jews represent it, ordered that nothing which breathed should be left alive, but all slaughtered in that town, among others, in a former age.

This is not the fruit of rationalising ; it is the true effect of that faith which holds that the Lord God, the Redeemer under the Gospel Covenant, is the same Lord God spoken of in the Old Testament, who said of Himself, *I change not*, “*Conditor utriusque Testamenti.*” It is not the theologian, nor the rationalist, but it is a reasonable faith, which insists on seeing in the Gospel a resurrection of the Old Testament, which, having fallen asleep in Malachi with the words of hope on its lips, and having lain buried without seeing corruption, rises again vivified and spiritualised in the new dispensation, which is to the old, as Christ’s body at his resurrection was to the body which He had before.

Therefore the task that lies before the Church of England is no mere modernising of obsolete words, nor mere polishing of the surface, but it is no less than to set forth the Old Testament in such wise,

that it shall not be rebuked by the Gospel, and to supply the English-voiced intellect in the whole world with a homogeneous Bible.

Society gives many indications that a move forward is in progress, analogous to that of the sixteenth century, among thoughtful men, towards an apprehension of the Old Testament more consistent with the temper of the Gospel than that which has long been admitted.

The Hebrew language is now as well understood, and by as many, as the Greek language was in the sixteenth century. The translators of our Bible, and the editors of 'Walton's Polyglott,' knew Hebrew perfectly, *as it is taught in the Septuagint*; and in Lightfoot and the elder Buxtorf the Rabbi of the days of St. Jerome was reproduced.

This is not the place in which to explain how the Hebrew and its cognate dialects have come to be explored without dependence on the crutches of the Septuagint and of the Rabbi. As Hebrew is studied solely for the sake of the Old Testament, every step gained in the knowledge of the language is a step in advance into the true meaning of those Scriptures.

Had the Church kept her current version of the New Testament up to the level of the still advancing knowledge of Greek among the learned, the Church would have benefited in influence, as much as she did in doctrine, from the step gained at the Reformation, and would have escaped the evil of the divisions consequent on it.

It was through Wycliffe's and Tyndale's versions, and Cranmer's published Bible that the Church of England was enabled to speak peace to the people at her Reformation, and to preserve her Apostolical dignity from a scathing similar to that which has withered the Church in Germany.

The Church of England has now at her command authority and learning qualifying her to interpose, by the exhibition of a revised and re-edited Bible, between those who, at a great disadvantage, are maintaining the truth out of an inadequate translation and a fatally confused text of the Old Testament, against some who charge on the original the contradictions of translators ; and against others who overlook the fact that the Scriptures were not sent among men to explain themselves, but with the promise of an accompanying Spirit alone able to explain them.

It is undoubtedly true that there is no article of belief remaining to be discovered in the Scripture ; all such were pointed out by the Spirit to the Apostles ; but there is much to justify and vindicate the faith still lying in the Old Testament obscured by interpretations given by men who lived before Christ. It is in this direction that more light from the Old Testament may be expected, or rather light more appreciable by those who depend on their own mother tongue alone to give them the true meaning ; though, even in their case, the real spirit of the holy text often overpowers and shines through a weak translation as the sun shines through a flame ; and secular knowledge often helps translation to a fit sense, as, when reading that *God hates*, it is understood as when we read the *sun rises* ; notwithstanding the language, the mind, in the one case, does not impute passion to the Lord, as, in the other case, it does not assert motion in the sun.

2. The Church, when translating and interpreting the Old Testament, must ever bear in mind that hitherto the Church in translating has been guided by a version, the Septuagint, made by Jews, and that our Lord warned his Church that the Jews had



misunderstood the doctrine of their own Scriptures, and that therefore a Jewish view of the doctrine in them cannot be accepted without great caution by the Church of Christ.

It was not concerning the prophecies relating to Himself that our Lord expressed astonishment at the ignorance of Scripture truth exhibited by a master in Israel, or declared that their learned men erred, not knowing the Scriptures; but our Lord re-proved them for a misunderstanding of Scripture, amounting to a perversion of it, with respect to the moral meaning of the law of God, to the intention of his commandments, and generally to the power of God.

Such misapprehensions and perversions would be manifested, if anywhere, in a translation of the original Scriptures made by Jews, such as the Septuagint. In transfusing the original its essence would escape through the incapacity of those who handled it. The translator could do no more than give what he considered the meaning of his original, but if he misapprehended the Spirit of it, his version must be carnal. If it is thought that St. Jerome, a Christian Father, in composing his Latin version

would restore to the Scripture the Spirit which they lost when being translated by Greek-speaking Jews, it must be remembered that St. Jerome trusted, as translators, Jews who denied Christ, and therefore were further from the Spirit than their ancestors, the Greek Septuagint translators.

It is not suggested that the interpretations of words supplied by the Jews to St. Jerome were ever intentionally given incorrectly ; but this is certain, that the Jews taught the Old Testament to the Church. St. Jerome states that Origen himself, and Clement (of Alexandria), Eusebius and others, when, reasoning on any text, they wished to adduce proofs, were accustomed to write, *a Hebrew told me so*, or, *I learnt it of a Hebrew*, or, *such is the opinion of the Hebrews*. The Church, in fact, having no knowledge of the Hebrew tongue, was like the Israelites in Saul's days when they had no smiths in Israel, and she had to go down to the Jews to furbish arguments on the Old Testament for her, as the Israelites had to go down to the Philistines to sharpen every man his tools.

It would be an easy matter to deal with Jewish misunderstandings of Scripture, if they dated only

from the days after Ezra; but the old prophets are as explicit and emphatic as our Lord in declaring that the ancient Jews in and before their days acted on a misconception of the meaning of the Lord expressed in the Scriptures. And from the first giving of the law, the Spirit testifies of the Israelites, *they have not known my ways*. Hence, not only that which Jewish interpreters have written, but that which the Israelites at all periods of their history considered to be the will of God, and as such acted on, may be lawfully suspected to be a misconception of his will and commandments. And therefore his intentions cannot safely be deduced from anything the Israelites did, *thinking they did God service*; all must be sifted by the law and the testimony before we can tell what is the wheat and what the chaff.

But this indispensable preparatory process has never been performed by any who have translated Scripture. Wherever they read *the Lord said*, they unhesitatingly asserted that the Lord had said it; they did not pause to inquire whether the Jews interpreted the text to mean that the Lord had spoken to the purport stated, or whether the Lord

had actually so commanded them. However, in speaking of the misconceptions entertained by the Israelites of the Lord's providential processes in governing the world, we must premise that they always retained many most true and distinct notions of the Almighty, such, in fact, as broadly distinguished them from nations who had no revelation. They attributed all government to one God; they knew sin to be the cause of all misery; they believed that with God there was forgiveness.

Lord Bacon's dictum, that *it were better to have no such opinion of God at all, than such an opinion as is unworthy of Him*, is not applicable to the Israelites at any time of their existence as a nation. Yet, our Lord's words to the Jews, *Ye say that He is your God; ye have neither heard his voice at any time, nor seen his shape* (John v. 37), justify us in believing that even on occasions when God spoke to them, or manifested Himself to them, when He gave the commandments and suffered Moses to see his goodness (Exod. xxxiii. 19), they misunderstood Him, and misconceived his nature; for the shape of God, *εἶδος Θεοῦ*, must mean his will and nature, for they *saw no similitude*. They erred, therefore, in

their conception of the Lord the King, as well as in that of the Lord the Messiah ; and, as the Church cannot accept their views concerning the dispensation of grace, so neither can the Church accept their views of the dispensation of the law, it remains to be cleared of the untempered mortar with which Jewish passions and self-interest daubed it. Our Lord is the only Jew whose opinion on the matter of the Old Testament can be accepted by the Church.

From this general assertion of the misconceptions of the Israelites with regard to the Lord, not only all inspired men must be excepted, but also multitudes whom the Lord knew as his. It applies to those who are always most prominent in history, the leaders of opinion, the guides acceptable to the multitude. The opinions of such men and the doings of their followers occupy a large space in the Old Testament, as the doings of the Pharisees and Sadducees and of their creatures do in the New Testament, and, in process of time, a notion of the Lord seems to have prevailed almost universally among the Jews derogatory to his true nature, and erroneous regarding his intentions towards men, and by this opinion they



interpreted Scripture. For, as things seen by coloured light appear to have themselves the same colour as the light cast on them, so will Scripture appear to have the very same temper as that of the man who views it. That only is the true light which shows things in their proper colours, and that only is the true temper which reads Scripture in the spirit which dictated it.

3. An apt illustration of an ancient Jewish misconception of Scripture, affecting both their conception of the nature and attributes of the Almighty, and also of his moral government of mankind, is to be found in the view which they took of the text that speaks of the Lord's visiting the iniquity of fathers upon the children.

The infirmity of the ancient Jews in infusing a human temper into a divine precept, and the easy acquiescence of Christian minds in adopting the Jewish view, may be illustrated by inspecting the text, where we read that the Lord visits the iniquity of the fathers upon the children to the third and fourth generation of them that hate him.

Early English Bibles said, visiting the *sins* of the fathers upon the children, as the text still reads in

the Communion Service. King James's translators wrote, the *iniquity* of the fathers.

We approach the consideration of the text by observing that it is part of a supplement appended to the commandment which forbids, not sins against our neighbour, but, multiplying objects of worship, either by acknowledging more gods than one, or by worshipping images. Consequently, the original Hebrew does not speak of *chatah*, sin of man against man, but of *avon*, sin against the Lord in the form of idolatry. The word *avon*, including the sense of *vanity*, idols being *vain things* (1 Sam. xii. 21), is restricted in Scripture to the sin of idolatry, and of adultery the synonym of idolatry (Numb. v. 14), and means an *idol* Is. lxvi. 3. Those guilty of the iniquity denounced are said to be those who *hate God*; and as Maimonides rightly observes, none are said to *hate God* except those who worship idols. Opposed to these in the precept, are those who *love God*; which is applied only to those who abide in the true faith. They who practise his commandments, are said to *know God* (Jer. xxii. 16).

In passages which treat of religion, the *fathers* are the *teachers*, the *children* or *sons* their *disciples* or

*followers*, who in all ages have taken the name of their teacher to designate their schism, and have disobeyed our Lord's injunction, *Call no man your father upon earth.*

This inspection of the original Hebrew, made without any disturbing bias, shows that the Lord forbade the acknowledging of any One but Himself as God, and the worshipping of images; and then declared the duration of his forbearance with perverters of religion to be limited to the fourth generation of men who continued so long to hold the heresies and idolatries taught by the original author of the heresy, the spiritual father of whom they have been the children. *To four generations*, is the space given to communities to repent in, and amend in; after which the Lord's corrective and punitive forbearance is superseded by his judgments. It notes a period, in opposition (in this place) to the fact stated that there is no definite period assigned to the operation of God's mercy in the case of a succession of men loving Him by keeping his commandments. The commandment therefore has no reference to the crimes of an ancestor as involving his descendants in punishment. It could not con-

sistently refer to crimes, because it is in the first table, which deals with man's conduct towards God, his profession of religion. A father's excesses entail disease on his offspring in the economy of nature; a father's forgery is a reproach on his children in the economy of society. Crime is personal, and not hereditary. Original sin is a reality, but original crime is an imaginary thing.

The universal error of the Jews on the point may be detected in the question which the disciples put to our Lord concerning the man who had been born blind: *Who did sin, this man or his parents, that he was born blind?* and the words of the Pharisees, *Thou wast altogether born in sin*, show that they held punishment to be original, in the sense in which we apply the word in the term *original sin*. But it required an inspired prophet to controvert the inveterate opinion of the Jews that descendants were tormented, even if guiltless, for crimes committed by an ancestor who may have suffered no punishment for them. For such is the import of the proverb, which passed among them for theology, *The fathers have eaten sour grapes, and the children's teeth are set on edge* (set an edge, correctly) (Ezek. xviii.). They



did not consider that it was but mockery on the part of the Psalmist to say, *Be not like your forefathers a stubborn generation*, if they had to suffer for the stubbornness of their ancestors, whether they were docile or not.

The Jews saw that some wicked men enjoyed great immunity from misfortune ; they themselves were in extreme misfortune. They imagined that the Lord, who had overlooked the sins of their prosperous ancestors, was at length punishing those sins in them, their innocent posterity. Hence the proverb which they framed on their corrupt understanding of Scripture.

There is also a natural vindictiveness in man which inclines him to injure the children of a man who may have offended him ; and the besetting error of the Jewish conception of the Lord was, that they thought Him such a one as themselves were. They saw a human, not the divine temper in the precepts of Scripture.

The commandment forbidding children to be punished for their father's sins, is of itself sufficient to preserve us from supposing that the Lord punishes a child because the child's father sinned ; for though



the Jews had not the same light as we have, we know that the Lord commands nothing but what He Himself practises. The object of his commandments and of his grace being, to make man treat his neighbour as the Lord treats him. And if He commanded men to refrain from punishing children for their father's fault, it is because He refrains from doing it.

The ancient Jewish misconception of the text has prevailed, and has been accepted by Christian writers. When, however, the text comes to be looked into, it cries out to the Spirit which is in the Gospel to deliver the word of God which is in it from its perversion by them of old time. And, by the instance of its own case, warns the Church to beware of receiving either the ancient or the more recent views of the Jews concerning the morality of the Old Testament and their interpretation of the record of the motives and government of the Lord, and to look for herself, she *having the light*.

4. We have depended greatly for the meaning of words spoken by the Lord on a Greek translation and on a Chaldee translation, both made after the return of the Jews from Babylon. Invaluable

helps as they are, they are not adequate interpreters for the Church of Christ.

As the learned Bochart has remarked, Babylon was, to the tongue of the Hebrew speaking race, what its predecessor Babel had been to the post-diluvian race. The language of the Jews was confounded at Babylon. They reckoned many things lost by them there; but among them they did not assign importance to the language of Moses and the prophets, which also they lost there. What they have since recovered of it has been taught them by other than Hebrew lips.

No one would be satisfied now with the meaning of a Hebrew word given by the Rabbin in the fifth century, as St. Jerome was. He himself rejected the meaning which they offered him wherever the Church had given another; and, by so doing, he shows how the Church must judge everywhere in Scripture by the Spirit of Christ. The days are past in which the linguist trusted to the Septuagint as his only Hebrew vocabulary; yet, it is apparent that the Rabbin, in St. Jerome's days, owed their knowledge of Hebrew, indirectly and unconsciously perhaps, but still undoubtedly and actually, to the

Greek version, however strongly they may have deprecated the suspicion ; for they could not explain a word such as Shiloh, in interpreting which the Greek and the Chaldee expounders seemed to differ ; nor the word *Selah*, which both had left unexplained ; nor could they assign the proper vowel sounds to the name *Jehovah*, which the Greek translators had not transferred to their pages. There are even in the Rabbinical writings some confessions that this and that Rabbi learnt the meaning of a Hebrew word from hearing the same word used by the Arab. It may be that the Almighty took away the knowledge of the language of Moses from the people that had perverted its scriptural meaning by assigning carnal significations to spiritual utterances, at the Captivity, and hid it through the ages till it should be again acquired by the Church, when the Church had had time\* to grow strong in the Spirit.

It was not till the sixteenth century that an attempt was made to judge of the meaning of the Hebrew Scriptures without calling in the Jew, who, till then (for the Seventy of Alexandria were Jews), had dictated, and still to a great extent is allowed

to dictate, to the Church how she is to understand them.

It was in Southern Spain that Isaac and Ishmael, who had parted at Abraham's tent at Mamre three thousand years before, met again; the descendants of either had greatly varied the tongue which both spoke in Abraham's tent. The Jew had lost his, and reckoned the Arabic to be the tongue which his fathers had lost; so that, at first, works by Jews such as Maimonides were written in the Arabic language with a Chaldee type of letter, and accepted as Hebrew by the Jews for some time. It was through an Arabic translation of the Greek Alexandrian Scriptures that the Jews in Spain grew to know the meaning of the Hebrew Scriptures.

It was there and thus that those scholars were formed who elaborated the Complutensian Polyglot under the auspices of Cardinal Ximenes, on the pages of which the various versions of the Scriptures were again set face to face with the original Hebrew for the first time since Origen had compiled his "Hexapla."

## VI.

## TRANSLATION AND INTERPRETATION.

1. Some causes of imperfections in the English authorised version.
- 2. When interpretation struggles with translation the context is the umpire.—3. National prejudices have swayed interpretation.—4. Corrupt theology has darkened it.—5. The two streams of prophecy in Isaiah.

1. WHEN St. Jerome was engaged on a revision of the old African and Italic-Latin versions, St. Augustine's wish was that the proposed Vulgate should be made closer to the Greek Alexandrian version than the old Latin was; St. Jerome proposed to make it nearer in meaning to the original Hebrew. It seems, indeed, to have been a matter of doubt among some men in that day whether it would not be more orthodox to subordinate the Hebrew text to the Greek translation, than to tacitly disparage the renowned Septuagint (*quorum est gravissima auctoritas*, says St. Augustine) by treating



it as not equivalent in value to the original Hebrew. When St. Augustine describes the Jews as merely librarians to the Church, *tanquam capsarii nostri sunt, nobis studentibus libros portant*, he understates their office; for he overlooks the fact that they handed to the Church, not simply their books for the Church to interpret to her people, but their own Jewish interpretation of them, the Septuagint, which the Church accepted without enquiry as to its identity of meaning with the Hebrew books.

The authorised English version has imprinted itself on the world more widely than the Septuagint did; and whatever English version may seek to supersede it, it will keep its place, as the Septuagint has. It has been incorporated into the whole mass of theology written in the English tongue since the days of its appearance. It has always been carefully quoted *verbatim*, and as long as Waterland, Warburton, and Butler occupy places on the book-shelf of the student, that English version also must have a place beside them. The conviction, that it never can be so superseded as to become obsolete, reconciles old students of it to the attempt at revising it, which is now in progress.

When it first appeared, it carried forward the interpretation of the letter, by a vast step, nearer than ever before, to the mind of the Spirit ; but its diction being Anglo-Latin, there must be classes of words in it which ought now to be modified ; the diction of the people having since been modified.

Its compilers were men who were accustomed to think and to write in Latin, and who knew the Scriptures in the Vulgate Latin.\*

We detect their subserviency to the Vulgate, as the Church tongue, by their practice of simply adding a Saxon affix or expletive to the root of the Latin word used by the Vulgate, and putting the word so modified into their text, with very little regard for the Hebrew word before them. Where, for instance, the Hebrew has *nissah*, *to test or try*, if the Vulgate

\* It ought to have been made a rule by the authors both of the English Bible and English Prayer Book to adhere to one consistent vernacular type of words throughout. The observance of such a rule would have obviated obscurities. But instead of doing so, they imported words of scholastic Latin use to serve for the use of the unlearned reader. An instance occurs in the Nicene Creed, where the important word *ὁμοούσιος* is translated, scholastically, *of one substance*, whereas it is, in English, *of one being* : hence the Creed, if taught in those terms, cannot (in that place) be taught in the vulgar tongue as directed.

had *tentavit* they wrote *tempted*; if the Vulgate had *probavit* they wrote *proved*.

The English translators in their preface justify themselves for not everywhere translating the same Hebrew word by the same English word; but they cannot be justified for following the guidance of the Vulgate in using one and the same English word to translate six or seven different Hebrew words, especially when the Hebrew uses those words, not indiscriminately, but with a special discrimination required by the matter treated of.

By having done so they have overlooked and practically suppressed the fact, so consistently marked in the Hebrew, that though we may say that wicked men such as Goliath or Shimei *curse*, we must not, according to the Hebrew, say that God or good men ever *curse*. Overlooking this distinction, scrupulously observed in the Hebrew, our translators make God say, *I will curse them that curse thee*. This translation ignores and obliterates a punctiliousness and delicacy in the Hebrew which confirms St. Peter's doctrine, that though the Lord is reviled He revileth not. For the Hebrew writes that God *degrades* or *impoverishes*, *arar*, the wicked, not that

He *curses* or *reviles*, *qalal*, them. So that the Hebrew requires us to read, *I will degrade them that revile thee*, the Lord being the speaker.\*

In sentences such as *cursed is the ground, cursed be Canaan*, and without a single exception, wherever the Lord or good men are the speakers, the word is *arar*, *impoverish*. Where violent men speak, it is *qalal*, *revile*. Of these two words the former cannot be translated curse, though the latter reasonably may : the former is prophetic, or at most minatory, the latter malevolent. This serious defect in the English version nullifies St. James's saying that blessing and cursing do not proceed out of the same mouth, for it represents the Lord as cursing as well as blessing.

The compilers of the authorised version were restricted to the *translation* of the text, or to the making of a better version out of several preceding good ones. Hence they did not concern themselves to reconcile inconsistencies, such as the

\* This meaning of *arar* is particularly observable where Joshua degrades the Gibeonites and sentences them to be hewers of wood and drawers of water, the lowest of menial offices. The English version says they were declared to be *cursed* (Josh. ix. 23).

above, by any substantial divergence from received versions.

Those, also, who look into the Bible with an eye that takes in at once more than a solitary word or idiom, are perplexed to understand how they could write that the Lord intended to drive the seven nations out of Canaan *himself*, by the instrumentality of panic and noisome insects, and simultaneously to write that He intended the *Israelites* to slaughter them and expel them with the instrumentality of the sword.

If the projected revision proposes to remove such ambiguities, the task before the revisers is more arduous and glorious than that which fell to the lot of Ezra when he rehabilitated the Scripture rolls after the captivity. But if the revisers simply correct the diction of the present English Old Testament by obvious literal amendments, such as accumulate on the *adversaria* or in the commonplace books of students of Scripture, their work will not lift the reader out of the mists of former translations upwards into *the body of heaven in its clearness*, but will be only a prelude to an inevitable and more effectual treatment of the Hebrew text.



2. In attempting a translation of the Bible, it is not possible to avoid oscillating between making a version and giving an interpretation : these are not synonymous; in the worker's mind the interpretation must precede the translation. The foolish words of Job's wife, *Curse God and die*, are an interpretation, not a translation; of the original; it is an instance where the force of the context overpowers the habitual meaning of a word.

The essential truths, indeed, of the Old Testament Scriptures are in many instances ascertained by weighing the interpretation of the text against a translation. A translation has only the weight given it by similar uses of the word; but an interpretation has in addition a momentum imparted by the context.

In the prophecy of the birth of Immanuel (Is. vii. 14) we have an instance of the necessity of allowing the context and the requirements of the subject to restrict a word of several meanings to one only meaning; allowing in fact the context to dictate to the translator.

That prophecy may unquestionably be translated, *Behold the girl shall conceive and bear a son*; no

philologist can possibly object to such a construing; the Jews, since the days of Christ, maintain that it is the correct translation. But the interpretation does not suffer it; the context compels us to understand something to be foretold which was beyond man's notion of what was possible, and this compulsory force of the context can be satisfied only by translating, *Behold a VIRGIN shall conceive and bear a son*, that is to say, *a virgin shall bear a son*. The Jews translated it so until national prejudice threw them back on another meaning for the word *almah*; and by so doing they furnish an illustration of super-inducing on Scripture, without altering the text, a meaning which perverts the intention of the Spirit by nullifying the context. We are justified in suspecting that this biassing habit of seeing an expedient meaning, instead of the intended meaning, in Scripture, has prevailed widely ever since the Scriptures were promulgated.

3. As the modern Jews have been biassed to translate *almah*, *girl* (Is. vii. 14), so the ancient Jews were biassed to translate *charam*, *slaughter*, instead of *interdict* (or excommunication), (Deut. vii. 2); where the Lord directs the Israelites how to deal with the

nations of Canaan whilst He was gradually driving them out. At this place, also, the context supplies the interpretation, for it details the particulars of excommunication, not of slaughter; and the word *charam* means *interdict* much more positively than does *almah* mean virgin: it is the intrinsic meaning of the word, and still is so, in the East. There is in fact, from the context and from the language, as much authority for translating *charam*, *interdict*, as for translating *almah*, *virgin*, in the prophecy concerning Immanuel, or *barak*, *curse*, in the words of Job's wife.

Unquestionably the word *charam* came in time to be used to imply destruction; it acquired this meaning from cases where things were *devoted to destruction*; *to* or *with the edge of the sword*, being either inserted after the word *charam*, as 1 Sam. xv. 9, or left to be understood, from the context. But as, from the context and concomitant expressed intentions, we must understand Cicero to have desired the *expulsion* of Cataline when he said, *Catalinam exterminari volebam*, though *exterminari* afterwards came to be used to imply *destruction*; similarly we are compelled to understand Moses to have intended the

*excommunication* of the nations of Canaan by the word *charam*.

The cruel treatment of the dispossessed nations by the twelve tribes would not be a startling passage in the Old Testament if the sanction of the Almighty had not been claimed for it. The whole subject will be fully treated subsequently; at this place it will be sufficient to suggest that a colouring has been given by translators to the original narrative, and to adduce some reasons showing the likelihood of its having been so coloured, and of the facts having been overlooked. The former will appear from appreciating a national bias in the Jewish nation, common to all other nations.

It is not improbable that the effect of a national bias on the interpretation of the historical portions of the Old Testament has been overlooked by us, since we know that the attention and acumen of the Church have been exclusively concentrated on those passages of the Old Testament which support the foundations of her creed; and all other passages, and, among them, those which exemplify the methods of God's moral government of nations, have been only cursorily translated, and have

been left to be discussed and formulated by expositors.

It can hardly be doubted that, if actual articles of belief were involved in such passages as those which prescribe the dealings of the twelve tribes with the proscribed nations of Canaan, a word such as *charam* (among others), which the Jews expounded as meaning *slaughter*, to suit their own tempers, would have been recalled, the Church being the interpreter, to the meaning suitable to the context.

Not only would the Jews naturally acquiesce in a version which claimed the sanction of the Lord for the military excesses of their ancestors, but also the studious among them would be the less likely to dispute that view of the case, because they devoted their interpretative abilities almost exclusively to the exposition of the ceremonial precepts, which held in the Jewish Church the first place, as articles of belief do in the Christian Church.

It was only the inspired in Israel who looked on Scripture as an exposition of the moral government of all nations by the Lord ; hence the difficulty of recognising and identifying, in accepted expositions and versions of the Old Testament, that method of



moral government attributed to the Almighty by Christ in the Gospel, and which must be enunciated in the actual Old Testament Scripture, and is to be found in them, though, it may be now, and has been for a long time hitherto, overlaid by a thick crust of human translations.

The national prejudice or bias which partially blinded the Jews, as it does all nations, in estimating the deeds of ancestors, was, the notion of a distinctive eminence of the founders of their commonwealth in warlike exploits and military supremacy above all other races. They accordingly took a facile view of the historical portions of the Scriptures, such a view as encouraged this opinion. The delusion concerning military pre-eminence was coeval with the first rise of their nation, and is detected in its most glaring aspect in the inflated record of David's mighty men of valour, inserted in the first book of Chronicles, secular not ecclesiastical records, from which it has been copied, and has been appended to the canonical Second Book of Samuel, there coming most incongruously after David's last meek words of faith. It being in the eyes of the Jews the especial glory of David to have been the leader of such cap-

tains; and Joshua in their eyes was what Cœur de Lion is to the average reader of English history; and David's triumphs over the Philistines to them as Edward the Third's victories over the French to us.

This fond conceit of national military pre-eminence, as the great feature of their history, has tainted the Jewish understanding of its records from their beginning. When David was established in the kingdom, he had an opportunity of sanctifying the nation to peace; but as Saul aimed at a standing army in Israel, so he yielded to the temptation of looking on the multiplied people as so many more additional instruments prepared for war, and took pride in numbering them. This, the true view of the case, makes us cease wondering at the severity of the plague which was sent to quench this military spirit. (2 Sam. xxiv.)

It was owing to these delusions that the Lord of Hosts is to them the God of armies; though *tsebah*, a host, when applied to an army, is only so applied as it is to the stars, because of the number of individual objects; and is even applied to a congregation of women at the tabernacle door. (1 Sam. ii. 22.)

The selection of the meaning *armies*, to describe the position of the people with regard to the Lord, betrays the directive bias in the mind of the interpreter.

Again, when Moses, probably to distinguish the whole body of the Israelites who journeyed orderly in bands from the mixed multitude that accompanied them in a disorderly mass, wrote that they went out by *chamshim*, *fifties*, the Jewish mind saw in the word a vision of soldiers, and interpreted it *armed*; and the hurried departure of fugitives from the apprehended passions of the Egyptian king, transformed itself in the imagination of the Jew into the exulting departure of a military expedition bent on the conquest of Canaan. This exordium naturally prepares us to find the entrance of the tribes into Canaan interpreted as commanded to be, what indeed it was made, a mere hostile invasion.\*

\* Though the most probable and consistent translation of *chamshim* is *by fifties*, it cannot be positively asserted that the text should be so translated. However there is no reason whatever for translating the word, *armed*. *Chamshim* is *fifty*; the short *u* in *chamshim* is merely a Rabbinical suggestion, no part of the text; still we should expect *chamshim* to be duplicated if the meaning was *by fifties*. Pagninus translates it *quintati*, and after

4. It must sometimes have happened that translators of writings so full of knowledge above man's conception as the Scriptures are, unable in places to translate confidently, have given a conventional sense where they could not attain to give the exact meaning. All translators will be obliged to do the same occasionally. But having to select a probable

him the margin of Matthew Parker's Bible has "*set in order five by five*, as the word doth signify."

The Rabbins find the meaning *armed* in the numeral *five*, because they derive *chomesh*, a vital part of the body, from *chamshi*, *five*, as being below the fifth false rib, and unprotected, and therefore requiring defensive armour. Abner smote Azahel under the fifth rib, *chomesh* (2 Sam. ii. 23). The words *chamshi* and *chomesh* possibly have no relation one to the other. The lexicons give an Arabic word *chamōsh*, with the meaning *nimble*, which suits very well the Sept. translation of *chamūshim*, ἑυζωνοί.

We may remember that the Israelites ate the first Passover in the equipment in which they were to leave Egypt, which equipment was long held indispensable at all celebrations of the Passover, *thus shall ye eat it, your loins girded, your shoes on your feet, and your staff in your hand* (Exod. xii. 11). This was the equipment of pastoral, not military emigrants. They were also, when leaving Egypt, encumbered with their kneading troughs and clothes on their shoulders (Exod. xii. 34); and were so far from being equipped, or fit for bearing arms, that the Lord led them by a long circuit lest they should be terrified by the mere sight of a hostile tribe. They learnt their fighting habits subsequently where they learnt their idolatry, in the wilderness.

meaning, the speciality of the Scriptures compels the translator to see that his probable interpretation is consistent with the tenor of Scripture; but this rule does not seem to have been consistently observed. The Tempter promised Eve that if she and Adam disobeyed they should be *as gods knowing good and evil*. And in our English version the Lord is made to say that they became such by obeying the Tempter, consequently what the Tempter promised was the truth; which is difficult to reconcile with the title of *Liar*, given him by Christ.

Without stopping to consider whether *elohim*, in the argument addressed by the Tempter to Eve, *ye shall be as gods, knowing good and evil*, means *gods*, or, as it sometimes does *men in power*, such as *judges*, it, may with confidence be said that *to know good and evil* is not *to know good from evil*, which the Hebrew would express by saying, *to know between good and between evil*, but the original does not say this; but *to know*, in this place, has the meaning of *to practise*, to have a *practical acquaintance*; and *to know good and evil* means *to practise either one or the other as a man likes, without regard to the law*. The Tempter advised Eve to be a judge of what was right for



her to do, and not to allow the Lord to decide for her.

When the man had followed the Tempter's advice, the Lord is represented, in all translations, as confessing that the Tempter has been a true prophet; and that the man, by disobedience, had become like one of the persons of the Holy Trinity, *like one of us to know good and evil.*

We who know the Gospel hesitate to suppose that man is transformed into the likeness of God by acquaintance with evil in addition to his acquaintance with good. And we reject the translation as soon as we look into it. But it is very possible that translators such as the Alexandrian Seventy, the originators of this view of the passage, acquainted, not with the Gospel, but with the Babylonian theology (which taught that the Divinity comprehended both an evil and a good principle, a theory diffused then more widely far than the true conception of the Almighty), might thoughtlessly have represented man as becoming like the Deity by being admitted to the knowledge of good and evil; and might have thought that they saw this expressed in the original before them.

Here then, not the context merely, but the whole tenor of Scripture, all Prophets and Apostles, everything, in fact, elsewhere revealed, rises up against the current translation, and denies its claim to be an interpretation, and not only the compulsion of common sense, but also the grammatical construction of passages in the original Hebrew of like construction with the one in question, call on us to translate it, *the man who was like one of us* (having been made in our image, after our likeness) *has turned to practise evil as well as good.*

In a similarly constructed and grammatically parallel passage all translators have inserted *turned* as it is inserted above, compelled thereto by the sense, as (1 Sam. xiv. 21): *The Hebrews that were with the Philistines before that time, even they also turned to be with the Israelites.* Consistency with the tenor of Scripture seems to require the insertion in the first instance as strongly as the sense requires it in the second.

Here then we seem to detect another disturbing element, deranging the uniform and consistent current of truth, whilst transfusing it into the new channel of a translation; so that the interpreter of

the spirit abhors the translator of the letter. *There is One Spirit*, and only one, by which the Scriptures were dictated, and by which they must be understood. There have been *many* translators, and many tempers in which they have translated.

The temper which interpreters allow themselves to indulge in is shown by the opinion of St. Ambrose on this passage, *Irridens Deus hæc dicit*. He considered it consistent with the character of the Lord to mock man in his misery: the Son of God, indeed, was cruelly mocked, but *when He was reviled He reviled not again*. Yet St. Ambrose in a sounder mind contemplates the Lord's visit to Adam after his disobedience as a visit in mercy. His observation is a strong proof of the human spirit infused into all translations of the Scripture out of the mind of the translator, unconsciously and ignorantly. And translations of Scripture will never be to the spirit as the *body of heaven in its clearness* is to the sun which shines through it, until they are cleansed of the clouds of human passion which float in them and distort or shut out the perfections of the Almighty.

The face of Scripture in some places is tossed about by the efforts of mere translators as though it

were the great deep when the winds of heaven are striving on it. There will be no harmony till the spirit of the Gospel is suffered to breathe over the whole Old Testament.

5. The prophecy concerning Immanuel (Isa. vii. 8) has been adduced as supplying an instance that the Church in translating insists that the context gives the interpretation.

The part of the book of Isaiah in which it occurs may also be here adduced as a further illustration of the manner of reasoning by which it is suggested that interpolations may be removed from their usurped places in the text, and assigned to those places in which the context suggests that they ought to appear. The whole prophecy is completely contained in the following paragraph, ver. 14.

*Behold a virgin shall conceive and bear a son, and thou shalt call his name Immanuel.*

St. Matthew quotes no further : but the present text proceeds to intimate that, before the child (Immanuel) shall know to refuse the evil and choose the good, Syria and Damascus both should lose their kings.

It is evident that the text as it has long stood expresses this, and that accordingly the prophecy thus supplemented cannot apply to Christ, as St. Matthew makes it to do. We have, therefore, a choice of two things; either to read the text as it stands, or to reject St. Matthew's application of it to Christ. But if we read Isaiah with understanding, we find the child, in whose earliest years Samaria and Syria were to be subdued, was a child named, not Immanuel, but Mahershalalhashbaz, a name indicating this by meaning *speedy laying waste*; whereas the name Immanuel, *God with us*, indicated nothing of the kind. This perception immediately makes it apparent that the prophecy concerning Immanuel and that concerning Mahershalalhashbaz have by some lapse of an ancient copyist been intermingled. This becomes still more apparent when we strike out the word *moreover*, beginning the prophecy concerning Mahershalalhashbaz in the English version, and replace it from the Hebrew by the conjunction *and*; for there is no such expression as *moreover* in the Hebrew (nor in the Greek, nor in the Latin versions); the English translators here, as elsewhere, having inserted a word to cover, as far



as possible, a derangement of the text, instead of remedying it.

By writing out the prophecy concerning Mahershalalhashbaz and connecting it with the part from which it has been dissevered, it will be seen how much is gained in consistency and meaning.

The prophet, seeing that Ahaz doubted his deliverance from the oppression of the kings of Syria and Samaria, exclaims (chap. vii. 9.), *If ye will not believe surely ye will not be convinced*; and relates how the Lord directed him to give Ahaz more confidence in the prediction by writing the prophecy, and enrolling it as Scripture, and by naming his new-born son, *Speedy laying waste*. “Take thee a great roll, and write in it with a man’s pen, concerning the speedy spoiling and plundering of those two kingdoms, and call your new-born by a name prophetic of what is to happen. During the child’s first days there will be desolation in Israel, neither reaping nor vintage, but the people will live on the milk of their cattle and the honey of the bees, but before the child shall be able to distinguish between the names of father and mother, Syria and Samaria shall be

plundered by the king of Assyria." This is the paraphrase of the prophecy.

In the words of the English version, when transposed, it reads as follows:—

Chap. vii. 9. If ye will not believe, surely ye shall not be established.

Chap. viii. 1. *And* the Lord said unto me, Take thee a great roll, and write in it, with a man's pen, concerning making speed to the spoil, hastening to the prey.

Ver. 2. And I took unto me faithful witnesses, &c.

Ver. 3. And the prophetess conceived and bare a son. *And* the Lord said unto me, Call his name Mahershalalhashbaz.

Ver. 4. For before the child shall have knowledge to cry, My father, and my mother, the riches of Damascus and the spoil of Samaria shall be taken away before the king of Assyria.

Chap. vii. 15. Butter and honey shall he eat, that he may know to refuse the evil and choose the good.\*

\* *Butter and honey shall be eat* implies that the child alluded to would be reared in a time of scarcity when the land was uncultivated and bread wanting; as was for two years the condition of Judah after the sudden irruption of the Syrians and Samaritans,

Ver. 16. For before the child shall know to refuse the evil and to choose the good, the land that thou abhorrest shall be forsaken of both her kings.

The text required some modification, and the English translators mended it by inserting *moreover*, and *then*, without any authority and without removing the difficulty; what is proposed above amounts to leaving the Hebrew unaltered, and altering the scribe's arrangement of the text, not arbitrarily nor plausibly, but at the tacit dictation of the context and flow of the prophecy.

The straits to which expositors have been driven, when seeking to explain the text without disentangling the one subject from the other, may be seen in Tertullian's explaining *the riches of Damascus and spoils of Samaria* to mean the gold and frankincense offered by the magi to Immanuel.

So dislocated, in fact, and dismembered do the contents of the Book of Isaiah appear to us when, having mastered the book as it now stands, we pro-

and is described chap. vii. 21, 22. This confirms the opinion that the two verses concerning the eating of butter and honey and the fate of the two kings apply not to Immanuel but to Mahershalalhashbaz, nor the circumstances detailed occurred to the latter, not to Christ.

ceed inwardly to digest its contents, that Ezra seems to us to have found the rolls of the prophet, after the captivity in the condition in which Nehemiah found the walls of Jerusalem, on his visit to it, when he *viewed the walls of Jerusalem, which were broken down* (Neh. ii. 13). It must have been as Rabbi David Kimchi supposes, that a complete copy could be reinstated only from the collation of many dilapidated ones.

The book called Isaiah has never been reconstructed from the fragments; and it is difficult to see what *religio* deters the Church from doing it as well as it can be done. When a Bible is published, it is for assisting, not perplexing, the people.

The sixth chapter incontestibly proves itself the beginning of a great dispensation of prophecy; the five preceding chapters should follow, not precede. In the seventh the springs and head waters of two great streams of prophecy are plainly seen to rise.

One concerning salvation by the Virgin's son, to whom the name Immanuel, God with us, is assigned.

One concerning mercy and judgments; and of this stream of prophecy the names of the prophet's two sons are made significant—Shear Jashub, *a rem-*

*nant shall return*, of mercy; Mahershalalhashbaz, *desolation comes speedily*, of judgment.

When this is clearly apprehended, the matters belonging to each of these two streams of spiritual admonition, mingled now in the text of Isaiah, fall almost spontaneously into two distinct channels, in one peace is extended to the faithful as a river, in the other wrath is poured out on the wicked as water.



## VII.

1. Reason, Tradition, and the Spirit, as interpreters of Scripture —
2. Revealed and natural religion considered as judges of the truth.—3. Scripture appealing to the animal creation.—
4. Behemoth and the beasts of the field.

1. CULTIVATED intelligence, leavened with a true sense of natural religion, has long been engaged in endeavouring to disentangle the exact purport of the utterances of the Lord, and the actual methods of his providence, from their complications with the sayings of men and the counter methods of human wilfulness; the dispensations of Providence and the intentions of the Lord being interwoven with the processes of human systems of government and the passions of those with whom the Lord has had to deal, in the original record, the Scriptures, and still more in the current versions of it.

Meantime, conscientious and studious men affirm that the work is not needed, and must be hurtful; reckoning that the results of modern learning must

be subordinated to opinions long received ; and requiring the modern linguist and philologist to give place, as an expounder, to the schoolmen or to the ancient Fathers of the Church.

Intellect, in fact, contends with tradition as to which has the secret of the Scriptures. Intellect, though professing to proceed on the principles of natural religion, has sometimes failed to remember that natural religion was not a product of intellect, and did not originally reverence reason, but stood in awe of an unseen and external power ; and, overlooking this, some have earned for themselves the title of rationalists, considering that the miraculous and the spiritual in Scripture may be *reasonably* understood as natural events and intellectual things. To do this, however, is not to interpret and apply the Scriptures, but to judge, contradict, and deny them. It is as though a chemist, undertaking to analyze a compound, should first reject the special agents in it, and then deal with the residuum as though it were the whole ; for the specialities of Scripture are its inspiration, its miracles, and its mysteries : if these are eliminated the book is inconsistent and unintelligible.

On the other hand, the Scriptures are certainly darkened by those who claim a traditional interpretation as paramount in authority and unsurpassable in accuracy. The great Synod at Nicæa did not ask for ancient but for primitive tradition; things primitive have in them a positive speciality, which things simply ancient cannot certainly have: opinions not yet developed will some day be ancient, but they will never be primitive, though they may be true. For primitive doctrine did not express all the truth that can be known, the Spirit being promised to the Church to guide her into all truth by our Lord in words which mean, equally, that all to which the Spirit leads us is true; and that there is no guide to the truth but the Spirit; and that the Spirit will ever be guiding those who profit by it, not in framing additional truths, but in exploring spaces and perceiving features of truth which have always been before the Church in the Scriptures, though overlooked or not discerned; truths that can add nothing to the outline of the body of faith, the Creed, but which do fill up that outline with harmonious component parts.

Neither therefore has primitive teaching, nor has

ancient exposition, perfected our knowledge of the Scriptures, nor has any version done more than stereotype the knowledge of their import in the form to which it had attained at the time of the version, no further. Hence an ancient or mediæval exposition, though it may show the light then shining when it was given, yet if viewed as complete and final, interposes itself as a veil, shutting out and darkening the light that is yet to be given.

As the Lord's intention with regard to the individual member of the Church is, that he shall grow in knowledge, not satisfied in manhood with the spiritual attainments which he had reached in youth; so with regard to the collective Church, that she shall not rest in the knowledge to which the Fathers of the early centuries could attain, sufficient and laudable in them, but less than ought to have been attained to by the Church in these ages. And this greater and better knowledge ought certainly to be exhibited to her people by the Church of England in a riper authorised version and edition of the Bible.

A version, better, not because it shall express more plainly than before the articles of the faith once for all delivered to the Church, for the Spirit

interpreted them by the lips of Christ or of the Apostles, so that we unconsciously read such places in the Old Testament with the eyes of the Apostles, not with our own; but better, because in it the records of God's dealing with nations and individuals shall be so set forth in it that the things which are God's shall be attributed to Him, and the attempts of men to carry out or cross the purposes of the Lord shall also be so set forth, that the things that are Cæsar's shall be assigned to Cæsar; the kingdom and the people of God being sifted out, in the process of translation, from the kingdom and people of Israel.

We should have no grounds for hoping that a version of Scripture is attainable, which, without corrupting the original, shall yet make the book speak more worthily concerning God, did we not know that inspired sayings must have in them a living seed of truth ordained to ever more and more fruitfulness in proportion as they are watered from the Spirit poured out from on high; and that the Lord, having redeemed his people, has committed the growth of the Word, as of the Church, to the abiding power of the Spirit.



The early Church, that of the Fathers, looked to the Spirit answering her prayer for guidance into the meaning of the Scriptures, and they prospered in applying it to the need of the Church in their days; afterwards, the Church looked too readily to the art of the schoolmen as framers of conclusions and producers of proofs of dogmas out of Scripture; the Spirit was thought to work by the dialectician.

Thenceforth new forms and species of beliefs, such as belief in the intercessory office of the mother of our Lord, appeared; as if the matter of faith had first existed, in the Gospel, as some philosophers say substance first appeared, at the Creation, a formless protoplasm, capable of self-development and of elaboration into ever new forms and species. Many of these the Church suffered to be incorporated into her system, then taught as wholesome, finally insisted on as necessary. In still later times, and in our own days, the Church has looked on whilst the scholastic theologian and the rationalist have been actively and loudly contending before men, one against the other, as to whether of them shall prevail in establishing in men's minds his own views of the ways of God's providence and of the

methods of his dispensations ; angering at times, by her utterances, the schoolman by taxing him with superstitious mediævalisms, and irritating the rationalist by denying the sincerity of his motives ; but leaving her people to the guidance of conventional commentators, in whose opinions she tacitly acquiesced, but which she never authoritatively sanctioned ; herself still using a stereotyped ancient version which she treated as though it were as unimprovable as her Creed, though having the interpreting Spirit, if she would use it.

The rationalist will still say that nothing can be divinely ordered unless it approves itself to natural religion ; the Church affirms that spiritual religion is to be tested by the Spirit. Bishop Butler long ago interposed between these contending powers, saying, “Ye are brethren ;” but they who had done the Church wrong, in reply, charged the Church with seeking to drive reason from office in man’s mental convictions, saying, “Wilt thou kill reason as thou did’st sin ?” as she aimed at expunging sin from the sources of his motives, saying, “*Ye are dead unto sin.*”

The intellect and reason are supreme in matters

of science, and it happens that here and there in Scripture, as, for instance, in the account of the creation, there are in the Scripture narrative some things which the geologist thinks are geological, and the astronomer reckons astronomical. There is doctrine in every one of such passages in Scripture, and if there be science also, it is accidental not material. The Almighty, in speaking to the illiterate Israelites of things such as the solar system, had to enunciate certain facts concerning it in such terms that, while they continued illiterate, they might not apprehend false science from his utterances, and also so that, if ever his people became wise in natural science, they might not refute his utterances on the evidence of discovered facts. This offered no difficulty to an infinite intellect.

But as an understanding of the processes of creation is immaterial to the believer, who is saved by the redemption, not by the creation of the world, the Spirit gives no help to the Church in reconciling the inspired record with the scientific theory of creation.

The first chapter of Genesis is thought to be capable of many interpretations simply because

hitherto the Spirit has not supplied the one true solution; not because it is more abstruse or obscure than chapters which treat of redemption, nor from any special inherent difficulty in its diction.

We consider the fifty-third chapter of Isaiah plain and obvious to the reader; but it is so only because the Spirit has interpreted it. Had not the Spirit done so, the chamberlain of Queen Candace might have asked Philip for an explanation in vain, just as the geologist may ask the Church in vain for an exposition of the first chapter of Genesis. Nor need the Church shrink from acknowledging her inability to interpret the science in it; for the way of life has indeed been revealed and expounded to her, the processes of creation revealed, but not expounded. The time will come when the Spirit will expound this also to her.

Hence we see that the interpreting power of the Church is limited, first, to those spaces within the circle of the Scriptures which deal with the redemption of mankind; next, to those that treat of and justify the processes of the moral government of the world by the goodness of God.

Since, then, it would appear that there are some

things in the Bible which the Church has no commission to interpret, it should be well and widely understood that there is a wide freedom allowed to framers of interpretations on such parts of the Bible, which a man may indulge in without being thought to impugn the judgment of the Church in matters of faith in the Scriptures, because he believes Scripture to admit of, or countenance, an unusual or novel interpretation on matters not of faith.

It is still more important that all persons should know that commentaries are not Church doctrine, especially on such matters. For the Church is generally considered by men of scientific studies to ignore sound science and to sanction and advocate erroneous science. It may be said with much truth that the Church of Rome has made the Ptolemæan astronomy the canonical astronomy ; but the collective Church, from the first, has been preserved from complicating her doctrines with science, the inspired writers quoting the phenomena of nature without propounding scientific facts, much as the Apostles here and there quote an uninspired book without thereby investing it with the dignity of Scripture.

It is lamentable indeed that some should think



themselves to differ from the Church because they differ from theories which commentators have beguiled men to suppose Church doctrines; and to suppose that the Scriptures are defective or inconsistent because the wording of a current version is so. Even those who form such opinions do so with regret, and unwillingly; Scripture is too majestic to be lightly disregarded, and too imperative to be silenced; and all men have an opinion, more or less distinctly conceived, that the original Scriptures are capable of an interpretation which would exhibit them in all parts acceptable to those who *receive the word in an honest and good heart*.

Concerning matters which are not articles of faith, such as the process of Creation, the cursing of the ground, the extent of the flood, and, we may add, the sanction of war, if it is said that the plain words of Scripture, as set forth by the Church, sufficiently authorise the commonly received views, the fact that the Church has at times undertaken to revise her version, whilst retaining her Creed unaltered, proves that, on the showing of the Church, her version is capable of improvement in matters not of faith. The original, we know, is incapable of improve-

ment; all the various readings critically possible, if adopted, would not influence the sense in an appreciable manner; various readings, even of the Rabbinical points attached to the substance of the text, would not have that effect.

The hands of the Church indeed are tied, so that she could not, if she would, interpret anything otherwise than the New Testament, and consequently the Creed, understands it. In the spaces of the Old Testament into which the New Testament does not enter, the Church seems bound to adopt that translation, if the text can lawfully bear it, which brings the spirit of the Old Testament nearest to the spirit of the Gospel. She must not be overruled, in points affecting the identity of the spirit of the Old Testament with that of the Gospel, by any views of the meaning taken by Alexandrian Jews, who lived three centuries before Christ. If the Church cannot translate the Old Testament in a spirit different from theirs, to what purpose has the Spirit been given to the Church to guide her to the truth?

St. Jerome translated Moses under dictation from Jewish Rabbin; he cast them off when he took up

Isaiah, and translated the prophet by the light of the Gospel. It seems wonderful that the Church has all along used a Jewish interpretation of the greater part of the Bible ; but, in fact, it is so. The Church has never translated for herself, except some small portions of the Scriptures ; and yet our Lord warned us that the Jews did not understand even the books of Moses.

2. Though it is evident that the Apostles did not accept Christ from compliance with the influence of natural religion, but from an honest carrying out of the revealed religion which the Jews had, as their great privilege, yet our Lord declared some utterances of natural religion to be more consonant with faith than any that He heard in Israel. As, for instance, the words of the Syro-Phœnician woman pleading for her daughter, a heathen for a heathen, and saying, *The dogs eat of the crumbs that fall from their master's table*, and those of the blunt and honest centurion, *Give the word, Lord, and it shall be done*. Such persons spoke the language of that natural religion, as it is called, which the Lord kept alive in the hearts of the Gentiles from the first, through all the vicissitudes of the ages, and notwithstanding

all the excesses of idolatry, in mercy to them, that while the Jews had the superior privilege of a religion divinely sanctioned and capable of making them recognise the divinity of the Saviour of their race, when He should come, the Gentiles also might have sufficient light left them at least to perceive the holiness of that Saviour of the World.

By it Pilate saw far enough and clearly enough to recognise the innocency of Jesus, and to pity Him. The centurion at the crucifixion, by natural religion, also, discerned the truth concerning Him. Such men had not wilfully extinguished the natural religion that was in them.

It seems of the nature of the dispensation of natural religion that if it renounces the object for which it is allowed to man, it withers away, and man falls into a state differing from the wild beasts only by his *civilisation*, no check whatever on actions similar to those of wild beasts.

Accordingly, when the Roman Empire had rejected the Gospel offered to it, the habits and tastes of the people suddenly became savage. The public amusements which gratified them before pleased them no longer: nothing gratified them fully but

the sight of fellow-beings burnt or torn by wild beasts in the circus. As with individuals, so with nations.

To this withering away and departure of natural religion, in those in whom it failed to recognise divine religion when offered to it, we seem to have an explanation of our Lord's saying, *He that hath not, from him shall be taken away even that which he hath*, if these words mean that *the man to whom the Gospel is offered, if he rejects it and has not spiritual religion, shall be deprived even of that natural religion which he had*. The offer of the Gospel is a day of judgment; outer darkness is the lot of those who have been unfaithful in using the light of natural religion, if it was all they had.

If, however, it is asked whether a man, having once embraced the Gospel, may not in after-life shake off its doctrines and peculiar tenets, dissatisfied, it may be, with his view of the morality of some parts of the Old Testament, and fall back on natural religion and live uprightly by it; he must first consider well whether he still possesses the principle and powers of natural religion. It is only too probable that man, whose first state was that of natural religion,



if he once holds or is offered spiritual religion, and rejects or leaves it, falls back, not into his first state, but into a last state worse than the first, void even of natural religion.

Natural religion dies and is buried with Christ ; it rises a spiritual religion with Christ. That which was intended to be for a time, dies and is changed into that which is intended for eternity. Natural religion is swallowed up in spiritual religion.

The Church undoubtedly, with more or less knowledge, teaches everywhere the doctrines of things eternal, and a religion of the Spirit from heaven. He who would cast off the spiritual doctrines of the Church, because he cannot accept what is thought to be the historical, scientific, or even moral teaching of the Church on certain points, deceives himself if he supposes that he has natural religion to fall back on as a guide or strength. His choice lies between light and darkness. It is a sore temptation now widely besetting multitudes of noble minds, to have done with the Church and the sacraments, and to think it possible and easy to live a pure and upright life, fed only on natural religion, or, as it is sometimes spoken of, on common sense applied to the

Scriptures and to the Gospel. Such minds—and there is a multitude of them—still, however, hold to Christ with great admiration of his work, his precepts, and his example. They generally have two strong opinions: that the Gospel and Church, if indeed what they are said to be, would have succeeded better and would have reformed society; and that the morality of the Old Testament is contradictory to that of the New Testament. To such men a revised version and edition of the Old Testament, such as is required, would be invaluable.

The step which a man takes, by abjuring the spiritual religion of the Gospel, is not a step back to natural religion, but a fall into a state of moral capacity below that of the wild beasts; chained by the laws of the state, and disguised under civilisation, but restrained only by these from savage actions. This explains the phenomenal atrocities in revolutions, when the laws are paralyzed and civilisation extended. It also prevents our being astonished at cases where those who have been most kindly cared for, ever after hate their benefactor.

If a man would judge of the morality or truth of the Gospel by the aid of natural religion, he must

identify himself in thought with Socrates, Plato, or Cicero, illustrious exponents of pure natural religion, who had not tasted and rejected spiritual truth, and judge the Gospel after the standard which they applied to truth and goodness wherever they found them.

3. What is commonly called natural religion might fairly have been called human religion; it being the ashes and embers of spiritual life still smouldering after centuries of darkness in the *nature* of man; by which it is distinguished from the nature of animals, wild beasts, and devils.

When the Lord said, *the ox knoweth his owner, and the ass his master's crib : but Israel doth not know*, He contrasted the decay of religion in the people with the persistence of a quasi-religion in domesticated animals. The nature of the dog acquiesces in his master's wishes, as the nature of man ought to acquiesce in the will of God. The religion of which the animal is capable has man for its object; it is a religion in respect of obedience, faithfulness, and affection towards its object. Man's religion has no other principles, but it has a higher object; man being of a higher order, of *more value*, than the animals.

If the word religion must be restricted to that service which has God for its object, it is incorrect to apply the word to the faithful service of animals to man. However, there is a quality in some animals, distinct from instinct, because the animal loses instinct in proportion as it has it. The camel is of a race which has always acknowledged man as its keeper, and is unknown in a wild state. There are, on the other hand, creatures that have never been brought under man's control. The wild creature that is for a time tamed, is merely an individual civilised; the domesticated animal *puts its trust* in a superior being; so does its offspring. A contrast might be drawn out between the wild beasts and domesticated animals, corresponding to that between the believer and the heathen.

4. The Bible language marks a distinction, speaking of domesticated animals under the name of *behemoth*; of wild beasts of *chaieth sadeh*, *living creatures of the field*. Behemoth is always used of domesticated animals, *e.g.*, *Peradventure we may find grass to save the horses and mules alive, that we lose not every behemah* (1 Kings xviii. 5); and *chaieth sadeh*, beasts of the field, of wild beasts

of prey, *Come all ye chaieth sadeh, come to devour.*  
(Is. lvi. 9.)

In the account of Adam's naming the animals, the *behemoth* are distinguished from the beasts of the field, as though Adam classed the tame and the wild creatures separately.

The calling anything by a name implies in Scripture diction far more than giving it either merely a descriptive or an arbitrary appellation, it declares some position assigned or some relation established by the namer between himself and the creature named. This shows us the import of the Lord's words to Israel, *I have called thee by thy name, thou art mine.*

Noah is not said to have taken any of the *beasts of the field* into the ark, but only every kind of *behemoth*, domesticated animals, and this perhaps implies a partial, not a universal deluge and drowning of the world. For as only the *behemoth* are recorded as having been taken into the ark and saved, and as we know that the *chaieth sadeh*, beasts of the field, survived the flood, they must have escaped because parts of the world in which they lived were not submerged.



And in those parts of the world unaffected by the flood recorded in Scripture lived, it may be supposed, races of men who did not derive their origin from the man of Paradise, and who had no use of domesticated animals, but to whom all animals were wild and untamed, among whom no Abel had domesticated and kept sheep, nor any Cain tilled the ground. For these arts seem traceable to the influence of Paradise, the school of a holier and a happier race on earth.

On this point it is deserving of notice that the traditions of nations refer the introduction among them of domestic animals and of agriculture to external and superior intellects; no *αὐτόχθων*, aboriginal, originated, but Poseidon introduced from abroad, the horse, and Demeter, corn, into Greece; the impression among the people being that these were not attainments by civilisation, but gifts from beings of a race that had enjoyed spiritual advantages, access to the Deity.

There may possibly be some analogy, in the circumstances of their existence and habits, between the domesticated animals, *behemoth*, not known ever to have been in a wild state, and the race of men

that sprung from the man of Paradise—an analogy, the counterpart and opposite of which is to be found in the wild beasts, *chaieth sadeh*, and the heathen races in the world.

When Scripture saith, *the lion shall lie down with the lamb*, meaning that one race of men shall join communion with another, Scripture itself parallels the savage with the wild beast, the spiritual man with the domesticated creature. The distinction may very possibly be real, not fanciful. Paradise may have sanctified and won animal natures from the waste and from the deep as well as human nature. We are told something, but only a little, of the animal's position in Paradise. Popular theology is famous for its views concerning the serpent in the garden of Eden, and expounds the *nahash* to have been a snake, deriving, in this case, as in many, its learning from pictorial theology; but there seems no reason why the serpent, ὁ ὄφις ὁ ἀρχαῖος should be reckoned a snake unless we reckon *the Lion of the tribe of Judah* a lion. The very statement that the *nahash* was *more subtle than any beast of the field*, suggests that he was some creature more irreclaimable than they. Who can say that the days of

Paradise, had they endured, would not have subdued unto themselves all wild things, and grace, from the garden of Eden, as from a fountain-head, have diffused itself, reclaiming the creation by assimilating it to itself?

## VIII.

1. The Lord names Himself.—2. The words Elohim and Jehovah.
- 3. Scope of Scripture.—4. Creating, forming, making.—
5. Other races besides the race from Paradise.—6. The Lord walking in the garden.—7. The Cherubim.

1. THE Lord named man ; man named the woman ; the Lord alone names Himself. It was an offence to Him to be named by men Baal, though Baal means Lord, because Baal implies a lordship of mere arbitrary, unchartered despotism.

The sovereignty and lordship of God is not so. He turned man's inquiry aside, when man supposed that he was competent to know what He is, and bade man know that He is the opposite to time and change, being eternally and everlastingly the I Am. And so the Psalmist bids men *Praise Him in his name Jah*. His eternal unchangeableness enters into all the attributes belonging to Him.

These attributes, viewed from man's station of

duty, fall of themselves into two ranks ; in one rank those attributes of the Lord in which man can have nothing common with the Lord, no communion or fellowship of work with Him, they being beyond the power of the measure of grace in man ; such are the *omnipotence*, the *omniscience*, and *omnipresence* of the Lord.

And elsewhere the Almighty has proclaimed others of his attributes ; for instance, justice in retributing, saying, *Vengeance is Mine*, I will repay ; meaning that man has no concern in performing it, it is none of man's duties. The disclosure of such to man, therefore, does not import into man's condition any duty to imitate them. Consequently, the Lord did not proclaim them among other attributes when He proclaimed the name of the Lord to Moses (Exod. xxxiv. 6).

The attributes of the Lord must be infinite in number ; but *knowing whereof we are made*, and considering the limited capability of man, the Lord has limited man's duties to the imitation of those particular attributes of God which He proclaimed, and which it is within the compass of the measure of grace given to a man to imitate. But those attri-



butes which He did proclaim, mercy, graciousness, forbearance, goodness, truth, are qualities involving laws which the Lord imposes on Himself whenever He has to deal with man, and which, and none others, are imposed on man whenever man has to deal with his fellow-men.

The pious James Hervey suggests that the Almighty called this proclamation his Name, because, as no man ever forgets what his own name is, so the Lord, by his calling his name Mercy, Goodness, and Truth, intimates that He can never possibly forget to exemplify them in dealing with those to whom He has said that such is his name.

These are the matter of the moral law, the subject of the teaching of the Prophets ; the exemplification of them constitutes duty to God and our neighbours, which our Lord declared to *the law and the Prophets*.

St. Paul transmutes this proclaimed name of God into Charity, in which is found mercy : *Charity suffereth long ; grace, doth not behave itself unseemly ; long-suffering, is not easily provoked ; goodness, intends no revenge (thinketh no evil) ; truth, rejoiceth in the truth ; and he concludes that charity is a more excellent way, and a greater or more effec-*

tual means, than either truth or hope, for attaining to spiritual gifts.

St. John condenses them all into one word, Love ; God is love.

It requires a spark from one of these perfections of the Lord, Mercy, Grace, Long-suffering, Goodness, Truth—to make an action in man good ; for then the motive of the deed is baptised with fire and the Holy Ghost, and is a spiritual sacrifice acceptable, being kindled from one of those *seven lamps of fire, burning before the Throne, which are the seven spirits of God* (Rev. iv. 5) ; as a material sacrifice was acceptable if kindled by fire from the Lord, not if otherwise.

By disclosing these his perfections, the Lord created order anew in human society, which had become void of law. At the proclaiming of them the people that sat in darkness saw light. By showing Himself to be the author of religion, He regenerated natural religion, making it spiritual and revealed.

Every one who has set about interpreting any author, knows how much it facilitates the work, and helps him, in interpreting, to do justice to the

author's intentions, and to represent him faithfully, if he can beforehand make himself acquainted with the moral principles of the author, and with his object in writing.

It equally helps the interpreter of the Scriptures when he ascertains first, and continually bears in mind, the attributes and intentions of the Lord, their Author. It is, indeed, more helpful to do so when the Scriptures are to be interpreted than in the case of other books, because the Lord never vacillates in disposition nor contradicts Himself, as human writers sometimes do.

By no other means can the interpreter, threading the heights of man's presumption and the depths of man's infirmities, which Scripture details in order that men may know themselves, discern those things which the Lord has commanded and willed from those things which men have said that He commanded and desired. Every commandment recorded must be brought before the law which the Lord has imposed on Himself, and to the testimony which He has deposed concerning his nature. If any commandment or precept contrary to these has been attributed to the Lord as its author, it has been

attributed to Him ignorantly and falsely by man.

2. *In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth.*

There is no other way of translating the above text out of the Hebrew, though Elohim (God) means *trustees* under an obligation to perform some trust. The blessed Trinity is indicated by the word Elohim, which, though plural, does not however indicate the number of the Divine Persons in the Godhead.

The thing meant is that Creation was not undertaken, nor carried out, without a self-imposed obligation on the Almighty to keep to a purpose in creating, and to create under a covenant ensuring the fulfilment of certain intentions.

When we read that God *saw* what He had created, and behold it was *good*, we apprehend a certifying by inspection, as it were, that the purpose intended had been fulfilled.

Such a view of the matter may, it is hoped, be reverently held, though necessarily stated in words of man's devising. The Almighty, we further observe, having fulfilled a trust in creating, put man

in trust with what He had created ; He gave him dominion over the creatures, and power given implies a trust committed, by him who gives it, to those who are put in power.

Afterwards, the Lord put man into a still higher trust, He entrusted him with the safe keeping and tending of the garden of Eden. Thus responsibility originated ; man's appreciation of which is the measure of his moral improvement, and of his adaptability to the purposes of God. Hence it is, that races, on which responsibility is still unimpressed, hardly receive the Gospel.

The world thus began by an exemplification, on the part of the Lord, of faithfulness to a covenant by which He had bound Himself to create good things ; for, He did not rest from his work till all that He had undertaken to make was found to be very good.

The meaning of *trustees* is assigned to the word *Elohim*, not merely because it is applied only to persons put in trust, such as *judges*, who are called *Elohim*,\* and by our Lord to priest-prophets, *He*

\* The word *Elohim* must be translated a *judge*, not *gods*, where the witch of Endor says to Saul, *I see a judge coming out of the*



called them (*Elohim*) gods to whom the word of God came (John x. 35; Ps. lxxxii. 6), but because its obvious root is *alah*, which is the oath taken when a covenant is made, and is in Greek *ἀπά*, the wish uttered as to what should befall a man making a *earth*; to which Saul naturally replied, *What form is he of?* and the witch explained that she knew it was a judge from his venerable appearance and his robe of office: *An old man cometh up, and he is covered with a mantle.*

As *barac* is used for blessing and cursing, *cadash* for holy and profane, and other words similarly, so *alah* is used for making and for breaking a covenant; hence it is to be translated *perjury* or *covenant breaking*, not *curse*, in the text, *The curse hath devoured the earth* (Is. xxiv. 6). Also (Deut. xxix. 21), *aloth* expresses the conditions of the covenant where, unhappily, the versions have, *All the curses of the covenant written in this book*. Moses is speaking of breaches in those conditions, and the penalties consequent. Perhaps the plainest indication of the meaning of *alah* is Gen. xxiv. 42, where Abraham tells his steward that, if certain events happen, he shall then be free from his *elah*—his trust. E. V., *Thou shalt be clear from my oath*.

It has been suggested that the word *Elohim* is from a word *alah*, meaning to pray, for the Arabs now assign that word as the root of *Allah*, God. But there is no evidence that *alah* anciently meant to pray; and if it does so now among the Arabs, it is a sense imposed on the word in recent times. The Arabic language is of such antiquity, that it may originally have been the same as the Hebrew of Abraham's days; but no language has varied with the ages more than the Arabic has, so that a vocabulary of the Koran will not serve for ancient Arabic writings.

covenant if he failed to observe it. The ratification was called *Sheba*, as in Beer Sheba, the well where Abraham and Abimelech made a covenant; the whole transaction, *Berith*.

The Creator being *Elohim*, the image of God in which man was made was the likeness of the *Elohim*; and this, and not because the author of the narrative was a *Elohist*, is why the Creator is not styled Jehovah. Moses, having to speak of God as creating, speaks of him as *Elohim*, because the Divine Persons were parties to a trust in the work of creating. When ages had elapsed, and men had to be taught that the God who spoke to them was the same God who had created them, the Almighty is then mentioned to them as *He who is and was*; in Greek, ὁ ὢν καὶ ὁ ἦν; in Hebrew, *Yehovah*. To the title, *He who is and was*, the Evangelist added, “and is to come,” a future coming of the Saviour having been made known by the Gospel.

Man, having been made in the likeness of the *Elohim* (the Divine Trustees of the universe), was therefore like them, because himself *put in trust*; with the creatures first, with the garden of Eden afterwards; that man might fulfil the object for which man was

created, which was to be a *fellow-worker with God* in the purposes of bringing creation on the way to perfection. Those who are created anew in Christ Jesus are put in trust with the Gospel of the new creation to be *fellow-workers with God*, according to St. Paul. Bishop Butler speaks of Christianity as a trust committed to us. And the lesson taught by the Scriptures is, that the Almighty has been faithful in the observance of the trust He imposed on Himself; man unfaithful in the trust committed to him.

The notion of Jehovistic and Elohistie sects, and of a book of Genesis compiled by each sect for its own use, by the combination of which books the Hebrew Genesis has been compacted, seem dissipated at once by our substituting for the word Jehovah its meaning, *who is and was*, considering the word as containing a doctrinal sense, and not, as the Rabbin considered it, a word to conjure by, never to be understood, and never to be pronounced but by privileged lips on momentous occasions.

We observe that in the Gospel by St. John our Lord calls himself the Son of Man; in another place the *I AM* (viii. 58); in the Apocalypse He is *Jesus*,

*He who is and was* (Jehovah), and *the Son of Man* : all these are found in the first chapter. In the fourteenth He is *the Son of Man*. No one has argued that the chapters are by different authors of different opinions. So far was the word *Jehovah* from being a word so revered as never to be uttered, that, on the contrary, the irresistible impression left by a perusal of the Scriptures is that, like our word *Lord*, it was commonly uttered without even due reverence by the ancient Jews.

It seems very probable, also, that neighbouring nations used the word *Jehovah* in making treaties with the Jews, swearing by *Jehovah*, knowing that the word *Baal*, though meaning *Lord*, was not to the Jews a sufficient guarantee of truth in him who made oath.

God would not be called *Baal*, though that word means *Lord*, because *Baal* expresses only despotic, irresponsible dominion, whereas God would have his name to express his responsibility to Himself, *Elohim*, and the immutability of his nature, *Jehovah*, the Eternal.

Some of the superstitions of the Rabbin concerning the word *Jehovah* have percolated into the

Christian critic's mind, and partly hence, perhaps, the appearance of the word in the text, from its supposed power, has been taken to import much more than it does. But it can hardly have been a word unutterable, for there are indications that the neighbouring nations learnt to pronounce it. Fuller, in his "Misc. Sac." (vi. 13) quotes from a M.S. of Origen, *περὶ ἀρχῶν*, the following passage: *χρὴ μέντοι εἰδέναι, ὅτι οἱ τὰντα συνταξάμενοι, οὔτε τὰ τῆς μαγείας νοήσαντες, οὔτε τὰ τῶν θειῶν γραφῶν διακρίναντες, πάντα ἔφυραν, ἄπο μὲν μαγείας τὸν ἰαλδαβαῶθ, καὶ τὸν ἀσταφάιον, καὶ τὸν ὠραιον, ἄπο δὲ τῶν ἐβραϊκῶν γραφῶν τὸν ἰαῶια παρ' ἐβραίοις ὀνομαζόμενον.* *It must be known that they who put these things together, neither perceiving what pertained to Magian writings, nor discerning what was from the Scriptures, mixed things together, taking the name Ialdabaoth from the Magian . . . . . and from the Hebrew Scriptures Iaōiah.* St. Epiphanius also says: *ἔτεροι δὲ ἰαλδαβαῶθ δοξάζουσι, φάσκοντες αὐτὸν εἶναι υἱὸν βαρβήλω* (De Hær. xxi.), *Others of these heretics glorify Ialdabaoth, calling him the son of Bar Bel.* And Tertullian also mentions this name Ialdabaoth as being the highest of the Æons



of the Valentinians and Nicolaitans (Præs. Hær. xlvii.).

None of these Fathers suspected the real origin of Ialdabaoth, as a name ; but it is evidently a corruption of the Hebrew *Yah El Sabaoth*, the Lord of Hosts ; the *ts* in *tsaba* being written *s* in the Greek, and by the Aramaic pronunciation sounded *d*, as the Hebrew *z* became *d* in words such as *Zakan*, *Zakar*. This is the more probable as the Aramaic has not the word Sabaoth, and therefore knew it only by the ear. Origen, by assigning a Magian origin to the word, indicates as the authors of these superstitions the Babylonian Chaldee-speaking Jews, who did not join the caravans of their countrymen returning to Jerusalem, but settled in Babylonia. Bar-bel is the Son of Baal.

Tertullian declares *Achamoth*, the name of the Æon next in dignity, *an uninterpretable name*, whereas it is the Chaldee *Chachamoth*, *Sciences*, *Wisdom*.

It is difficult to estimate the disadvantage under which the early champions of the Gospels wrote from their ignorance of the Old Testament language.

Jaōiah, derived, Origen says, from the Hebrew

Scriptures, is *Jehovah*, and the manner of writing the word shows that it must have been an approximation to its pronunciation by the Jews; hence they did pronounce it in the hearing of other nations, though the Rabbin say that it was never pronounced.

The present method of vowelling the four Hebrew letters with which the word is written is due to Peter Galatinus, A.D. 1518. The initial letter is in reality Y, not J.

3. After that the Lord had made all things *good*, four epochs of sin occur crossing the Lord's purposes concerning the *good*; the sin of Adam, being the subjection of the spiritual in man to the earthly in him; the sin of the Golden Calf, the confusion of Religion with Idolatry; the rejection of Christ, the relapse of the chosen people into the position of the rejected races; and Antichrist, the exaltation of powers in nature into the office of the Creator, and of virtues in man into the office of the Saviour.

Scripture, narrative and prophetic, deals with these moral epochs; and, from first to last, through all the phases of perishing mortality, the Lord moves through the Scripture narrative, ever of one and

the same spirit; and a nucleus of faithful men, his Church, always of one and the same faith, surround Enoch, Noah, Abraham, Moses, David, Nehemiah, and the Apostles.

The Bible teaches the mystery of the four seasons of the year. We find the Church first under the midsummer brightness of Divine favour, in happiness under the tree of life; we follow it through the fading light of autumn, into the deep winter of moral darkness and spiritual numbness; then the Gospel brings spring, with its promises and returning life; lastly, the Apocalypse shows us the Church restored to the summer brightness of her first condition, with permanency added.

These vicissitudes affect not only the Church's enjoyment of good, but also her understanding of the will and intentions of God. As the earthly encroached more and more on the spiritual in man, the notion of God suffered degradation. In the days of darkness and numbness, God's righteousness was thought to be worked out by man's wrath in war. When human conceits infected true worship, He was thought to be most profitably worshipped if images were used to suggest his presence.

During the prevalence of the corruptions that were of old, the Lord spoke the law and way of true holiness, and the Old Testament Scriptures record both his word and man's opinion of it.

In the Old Testament, the light, his truth, is shining in the darkness, and the darkness, man's incapacity, comprehends it not; hence the Old Testament records, not only God's truth, but also man's misconception of it. The truth cannot be handled by man without being tarnished, nor put into use without being distorted; and if we take men's misconceptions of the truth, when we study the Old Testament, for the truth itself, *the light that is in us is darkness*; and if we deduce the will of God from man's delusive method of performing it, we must form a debased notion of the Almighty; for something of the substance of every commandment suffers under man's attempts at fulfilling it.

The field of the Old Testament is all valuable ore, which must be baptized in fire that there may come forth the gold, the unchangeable goodness of God; and the dross itself is useful, as showing us what we men are, and how the perishable co-exists with the imperishable in us; how hay, straw, and stubble may

be built up by men of misdirected zeal and dim faith on the true foundation ; for so, upon the moral law, statutes and ordinances that were not good were yet suffered to stand, some till the Refiner of the sons of Levi came, and some still suffered to stand till *the day cometh that shall burn as an oven, and the fire tries every man's work of what sort it is* (Mal. iv. 1 ; 1 Cor. ii. 11).

The Purifier, when He came, insisted on the integrity of every *jot and tittle* of the law and of the prophets ; He neither set aside nor altered them, but He purified them ; He retained the precept, *eye for eye, tooth for tooth*, but He cleansed the precept of the vindictive spirit of exacting penalties, which man had infused into it, and restored the original purity of import to it, bidding men fulfil it by rendering to others even more than was their due.

And many such sparks of purifying fire our Lord scattered over the Old Testament rolls, baptizing them with fire, to regenerate them for new uses in his Church ; by the Spirit given to which, the Old Testament will in time be renewed, not in letter, but in intention, as man is by the Spirit renewed, not in his body, but in his mind.



Much of the Old Testament is the detail of man's view of the Lord's will, and of man's manner of carrying out the Lord's commandments. The children of light must take care not to understand the will of God as imperfectly and dimly as those men did who lived before the true light came into the world.

To question and correct the notion which a Jewish high-priest entertained of the nature, will, intention, or word of the Lord is no presumption on the part of the Church ; it is but the lawful and intended use of the Spirit given to the Church to profit withal.

4. Moses has marked, by a careful use of three words, the phases of progress in the nascent world ; and Isaiah has enforced the significance of the same words when writing, *I have CREATED him, I have FORMED him, yea, I have MADE him* (Isa. xliii. 7).

The Spirit is not speaking, by the prophet, of the whole human race, but of Israel, nor yet exclusively of the descendants of the Patriarch who was so surnamed at Mahanaim, but of the whole *Israel of God* (Gal. vi. 16).

The Rabbin noticed and commented on the three phases of the divine operation, but, as usual with them, went beyond what is written and imagined a

Universe *proceeding* or *emanating* from the Creator (for such seems the import of their term *Atsiluth*), besides the Universe which we read of as containing things *created*; things *created* and *formed*; and things *created, formed, and made*.

The distinctive application of each of these words has not been sufficiently noticed. The English version of the Nicene Creed has missed exactness in declaring the Father *Maker* of heaven and earth, and by subsequently saying that He *made* the worlds by the Son. It seems more scriptural to say, that the Father *created*, the Son *formed*, the Holy Ghost *made*.

Of the heavens and earth, as simply *created*, it is not said that it was *good*; but the things that are pronounced *very good* are described as things which God had *made*, that is to say, perfected; God having brought the Creation to that degree of perfection which He thought *good*.

The Greek language offered the Septuagint the words *κτίζειν*, to found or originate, *πλάζειν*, to form or mould, and *ποιεῖν*, to make; but as their version uses the same word indifferently for *created* and for *made*, the distinction could not be noticed in the

Church till the Hebrew text came to her knowledge.

5. The existence of human tribes other than that of the man of Paradise, and located outside Paradise and Eden, may be deduced from Cain's expressed apprehension that, being sent away from the land of Eden, he would encounter tribes who would murder him as a stranger, the custom of all savage tribes; *any one that findeth me shall slay me*; not because he was a murderer, but, as he expresses it, because he was *a fugitive and vagabond*, a stranger in fact in the land. The existence of such tribes had therefore become known to Cain, and known as objects of terror. The Lord, therefore, it would seem, effaced from the person of Cain the distinctive features of the race of Paradise, *lest any finding him should slay him*.

These tribes must have descended from the human beings, *male and female created* on the sixth day. To this first race the fruit of every tree was allowed as food (Gen. i. 29); they lived, therefore, under no restrictive covenant; but man in Paradise was restricted.

The first unrestricted dispensation had resulted in

a self-willed practice, men reckoning everything lawful to do, as every fruit was lawful to eat; they practised good and evil indiscriminately. Hence the prohibited fruit in Paradise was a restriction on the eating of all fruit permitted before, a prohibition introducing the practice of obedience and self-denial necessary in a new race intended for a better state than the first created race had come to.

If this view is objected to on the grounds that the Creator having rested from his work of creating would not resume it, the objection may be met by the fact that Eve, *created* in Adam, was *formed* and *made* out of Adam, after that Adam had been placed in Paradise, God *built up*, constructed the woman of that which he had taken from the man. So the making of the woman was not an act of creation. In like manner the *forming* and *making* of a new race of men, out of the old first-created one, would not necessitate the resumption of the work of creation which God had finished and rested from.

May we not understand that God took Adam out of the wicked world, as He afterwards took Abram out of the land of idolatry; and placed Adam in Paradise to become the father of the sons of God,

as He moved Abram into Canaan to be the father of the faithful?

Or, are we to understand that the Lord, in taking *dust from the ground* to form Adam, caused the dust of some long-buried man to rise by a resurrection. For it is not said that the Lord took *earth-dust, dust of the ground*, but dust *out of* the ground; *aphar*, dust such as the Lord told Adam man becomes after death, even such as Adam had been before the Lord took the dust which he was *out of* the ground.

The opinion that there are no races of men on the earth but such as are sprung from the man of Paradise has probably arisen amongst us from the Bible concerning itself only with the descendants of Adam through Seth till the flood, and then only with the descendants of Shem; the descendants of Japhet and Canaan being mentioned, but other races ignored, as the children of men are before the flood.

Scripture begins with man, the child of grace, in a condition of abundant life and good, goes down with him into the valley of the shadow of death and centuries of evil, but brings him back at last to the tree of life (Rev. xxii.), and there leaving him



in life more abundant and in greater good, pauses at the threshold of a new state of things.

How careful Scripture is on the subject of purity of race appears in the statement that Noah's pedigree was untainted by intermarriage with the sons of men, for this is what is meant by the uncouth phrase, *Noah was perfect in his generations*, as well as just and righteous.

The history of the races who existed before the race from Paradise, and co-existed with that race, is unwritten; whatever judgments visited them on account of their depravity, the flood may not have touched them. It is distinctly represented as a judgment on a race which, having enjoyed privileges, had corrupted themselves through intermarriages with an evil race. They were reckoned with for their sin at the flood, which, therefore, was a punishment on them particularly, not generally on all races of men, who, whatever privileges they had abused, had not had the privilege of Paradise, the Church then, or of the Tree of Life.

We have been accustomed to consider that there were "*two* extraordinary trees in Paradise," as Scott expresses it, the tree of life, *in the midst of*

*the garden*, and also the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, forbidden to be touched.

The tree, the fruit of which Eve told the serpent she was forbidden to touch, and of which she ate, was *the tree in the midst of the garden* (Gen. iii. 3, 6). Therefore, in eating of the fruit of the tree which was in the midst of the garden, she ate of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil. It would seem, therefore, that we should read ver. 9, chap. ii. : “And the tree of life in the midst of the garden, *even* the tree of the knowledge of good and evil.” There are many places in Scripture where the Hebrew conjunction merely means *even* or *namely*.

We may conclude that the tree of life was made by our first parents a tree of the knowledge (practice) of evil, by their *feeding themselves* on it *without fear* (Jude xii.), using its fruit as common food, profaning it by eating of it unworthily, and so ate their own condemnation. It being sacramental, the bread of life, to be administered to man in Paradise by the Lord, at those times when He walked in the garden, and being then rightly received, *the knowledge of good* was imparted, differing from other fruit, as the elements at the Eucharist differ from other bread and

wine, *ὅν γὰρ ὡς κοινὸν ἄρτον οὐδὲ κοινὸν πόμα ταῦτα λαμβανόμεν.* (Justin Mart. Apol. lxvi.)

6. It would be well indeed if the Church version of the Scriptures could be so framed as to prevent any reader supposing that the Lord, in judging Adam, had or expressed any wish that what was to befall him might befall him.

Translators and commentators have looked on Adam as Simon the Pharisee looked on the sinner; they have not considered that He who spoke to Adam in Paradise was He who lifted up the dejected heart of that sinful woman.

That our Lord visited Adam, after Adam's sin, for the purpose of comforting him, cannot be denied when we consider that He found him naked, and clothed him. He found Adam in mental fear, in moral shame, and in bodily destitution, and self-excommunicated. Whatever curse had fallen upon Adam had been the Tempter's doing and the Tempter's wish. The Lord began his work as the Restorer by visiting the outcast and abashed sinners in Paradise.

It has already been noticed that *arar*, translated *cursed*, really means *impoverished*; the Lord's words to Adam detail to him the particulars of poverty;

his words to the woman, the loss of her social equality with man, her subjection to her husband. The condition of man, after he had sinned and when as yet the Lord had not visited him, is marked by his inability to meet the Lord in worship; after his expulsion from Paradise, when we next hear of man, Adam's sons are appearing to worship before the Lord without any deterring fear.

That the nakedness which man complained of was not nakedness of body, is disclosed by our being told that Adam and his wife had clothed themselves with leaves. Adam was, as St. Peter, sufficiently clad for decency; but, like St. Peter, *who girt his fisher's coat about him* before appearing before the Lord, Adam felt not fitly clad for the presence of the Lord. His nakedness must have been a moral consciousness, the self-excommunication so commonly adopted by men who live with grace within their reach, but have lost their relish for it: consequently, his clothing with skins by the Lord, as it was not needed for purposes of protection or bodily modesty, must have had a spiritual meaning, and a reconciling effect on his conscience.

Adam's hiding himself from the presence of the

Lord means that he neglected to attend the appointed place for worship, which in Scripture is invariably described as the *presence of the Lord*, somewhere on earth ; whether at the door of the tabernacle (Exod. xxix. 42), or before the mercy-seat (xxv. 22), or at the foot of Mount Sinai (xix. 17), or that mountain in Galilee at which the Lord appointed his disciples to meet Him when He should have risen from the dead, and where they presented themselves and *worshipped Him*, the first Church worship offered to Christ.

Our Lord appointed the place of his presence, saying, *I am in the midst where two or three are gathered together in my name* ; this is the place for that *public* worship which the Lord has always required ; this public worship, according to our Lord, to be offered where believers meet, being assembled by those who have his authority to gather the congregation. The words, *in my name*, indicate the distinction between private and public worship.

*The voice of the Lord God walking in the garden* is not the sound of footsteps, nor of the Lord's lips ; the Lord did not speak till he called for Adam. The *walking* is not progress by steps, but in the place now



considered it means, as elsewhere always in the Old Testament (except in a very few instances, such as *feet have they but they walk not*), *performing the duties of an office*. So Samuel says of his office as judge, *I have walked before you*; and of the king's being then in power, *Behold the king walketh before you*. So also the moon, when dispensing light, which the moon was set in the firmament to give, is said to *walk in brightness*; and the contagion, which smites without being seen, *walks in darkness*.

Solomon tells us that he had seen *princes walking as servants*, captive kings discharging menial offices. The Greek and Latin idiom had the same use of *to walk*: so, ὁς Χρύσην ἀμφιβέβηκας, *thou who watchest over Chryse*. And Cicero writes, “Et ego quæro, unde orationem, unde numeros, unde cantus; naturæ ista sunt non artificiosè *ambulantis*, ut ait Zeno, sed omnia cientis et agitantis motibus suis” (De Orat. i. 41), where *artificiosè ambulantis* means “discharging its ordinary functions.”

Where Satan answers the Lord, saying, *I come from coming and going in the earth and walking in it* (Job i. 7), the English version has hidden the meaning by writing, without authority from the original,

*walking up and down in it.* Satan's answer meant that he had been *walking about seeking whom to destroy*, which he had made it his office to do.

The walking of the Lord God in the garden was his presence there to do his office to his creature by giving grace to his worshippers for their daily renewing; for which purpose He still *walketh* in the midst of the seven golden candlesticks (Rev. ii. 1).

To translate *leruach hayòm*, *in the cool of the day*, to express the time of day, is simply to select out of many arbitrary conjectures one that seems not inappropriate; for certainly *the cool of the day* neither construes nor translates the Hebrew words. The Hebrews say, *when the day was cool, when the day was hot*; they do not know the construction *cool of the day*.

The Hebrew words *leruach hayom* (*cool of the day*, A.V.) probably mean *spirit* (grace) *for the day*, the object of the Lord's presence being to give his worshippers the needful *daily renewing of the Spirit*, the daily bread of spiritual life. They seem parallel with the expression *ἐπιούσιον ἄρτον*, in the Lord's prayer, which words are represented in our version *daily bread*: but probably the Syriac *soonchonah*, *needful*, correctly translates *ἐπιούσιον*.

The Hebrew construction, *mithallak leruach* (*walking in the cool*) is similar to that in *haholekim laredeth*, *walking to go down* into Egypt (Is. xxx. 2), which means *who promote a retreat into Egypt*; the prefix, *l*, in both instances importing *the purpose*.

And the voice (sound) heard in the Garden was either the sound of the wings of the seraphim, which Ezekiel heard (chap. i. ver. 34), or of the responsive hymn which Isaiah heard from them (chap. vi. ver. 3), at the voice of which Isaiah feared, as Adam feared, and exclaimed, *Alas for me, for I am dumb*, or *conscience-stricken*.\*

\* Isaiah, conscious that he was *a man of unclean lips*, was afraid to add his voice to those of the seraphim, and remained silent whilst they were praising the Lord in his hearing, and excused his silence, alleging the cause of it. The Hebrew *nidmeithi*, *I am undone*, A. V., is correctly translated in the Vulgate by *taeni*; in the Septuagint *κατανέννυμαι*, *I am abashed*, which is also the sense given in the Syriac. Our English version reads, *Woe is me, for I am undone*; actuated, it may be, by a strange notion held by the Jews that the sight of God was deadly. The text, *No man shall see me, and live*, is simply, *No living man shall see me*. Or the E. V. followed Calvin's commentary, "I have seen God, I feel my vileness, I fear death." The exclamation of Peter, when made sensible of the presence of Christ, *Depart from me, for I am a sinful man, O Lord!* was not a request to Christ to leave the boat, but Peter, *falling on his knees*, meant, *Refrain from judging me, O Lord!*

The worship, as in Paradise, had become too holy and awful for man ; he could no longer worship with angels, *he went out* ; the holiness of God drove out the man, as the holiness of Christ drove out of the Temple the sinful accusers of the sinful adulteress (St. John viii. 9). Or, as the priests were driven out of the Sanctuary into the court of the Temple (from the *ιερόν* into the *τέμενος*), when, on the Lord's descending on the mercy-seat, his glory filled the house, *ναός*, so that the priests could not stand to minister (1 Kings viii. 11).

7. But man was not cast out into the wilderness, or sent to dwell among the sons of men, the children of this world. The place of worship was removed to the gate of Eden, where the *two* cherubim were stationed to keep the way to life from being obliterated and neglected. As the two cherubim were placed over the ark and the mercy-seat, and man worshipped, when the Temple was built, at the threshold of the sanctuary, where the cherubim kept watch over the terms of the covenant contained in the ark ; so Adam worshipped where the cherubim were set in mercy to watch at the gate of Paradise. There acceptable sacrifices, as that of Abel, were kindled by the flam-

ing sword; as when *the angel of the Lord put forth the end of the staff that was in his hand, and touched the flesh and the unleavened cakes, and there rose up fire out of the rock and consumed them* (Judg. vi. 21); and so it was shown what worshipper walked in the way of life; or, if left unkindled, as that of Cain, the sacrifice was shown to be unacceptable, because the worshipper was evil.

These cherubim were the angels of The Presence (Isa. lxiii. 6); that is to say, the veiled presence of God invisible, the veil only being seen. *He maketh his angels winds, his ministers flames of fire.* (Ps. civ. 4.)

So, when the Lord dried up the bed of the Red Sea, He sent *a strong east wind*, the palpable evidence or angel of the presence of Him who by his mighty arm divided the waters. He fulfilled his promise, "My presence shall go with thee," by causing *His angel to go before the people*, a pillar of cloud by day, a pillar of fire by night, the angels of his presence, the cherubim.

When at last a house had been built for his name, the cherubim alighted on the mercy-seat, the angels of his presence there.

Providential deliverance ministered by the ele-



ments, by the winds or by the sea, was recognised by heathen nations, but they gave the glory to the angel, not to the Lord ; they offered sacrifices to the wind or to the sea, honouring the creature more than the Creator.

Each several creature which manifests the working of the Lord, his operations, is the angel of his presence ; both are present, the angel and the Lord ; the creature making perceptible the operating presence, out of condescension to the imbecility, and as a necessary help to the spiritual obtuseness, of man ; the wind, strength ; the cloud, comfort ; the flame, enlightenment, in the old dispensation ; in the new, the water at baptism is the angel of the presence of the Spirit ; the bread and wine at the Eucharist, angels of the presence of God in the flesh.

## IX.

## THE INVASION OF CANAAN.

1. In what works the Lord employs the agency of man.—2. What works He reserves to Himself.—3. The agents which He appointed for the dispossession of the Canaanites. — 4. How they were superseded.—5. Man in power goes beyond his commission. — 6. Man interpreting adds bitterness to the record.

1. THE long-unquestioned opinion that the Lord originated a kingdom on earth, in old time, by employing the race whom He had chosen to people it with in the work of slaughter, and by inculcating on them the duty of showing no mercy to fellow-creatures (Deut. vii.), is so opposite to the methods which the Lord, when He revived his kingdom upon earth, employed, instituted, and sanctioned, that the explorer of the ways of the Lord is driven to seek “most certain proofs of Scripture” concerning the principles on which human instrumentality

was originated as a power to co-operate with his power, that he may see whether he can find any principles enunciated supporting the view taken of the invasion of Canaan.

If the New Testament contained any approval of the military character of that invasion, the question debated would not arise ; but beyond the statement that men of old *waxed valiant in fight and turned to flight the armies of the aliens, by faith* (Heb. xi. 34), the part which the sword played is not alluded to. St. Stephen deals with the subject, saying, *the Gentiles, whom God drove out before the face of our fathers* (Acts vii.), and so do the Psalmists, who often allude to that passage in the history of the people, suppressing the deeds done in Jericho and Ai as writers treat things *which it is a shame to speak of*.

But the narrative in the Old Testament has always been understood as asserting the personal command and sanction of the Lord for all that was done.

It is difficult to handle the subject with an unprejudiced mind. The Jews would naturally be predisposed to favour whatever version most magni-

fied their ancestors as warriors and conquerors of the earth, and flattered their unhappy opinion that the Lord cared for no people but themselves.

On the other hand, some must confess to a predisposition to find that men have diverted the intentions of the Lord ; or have mistaken his commandments, judging that the manner in which a thing was done must be the thing commanded ; there being instances of such corruptions in man's administration of power entrusted to him. Whereas there can be no instance of the Lord's departing from those principles of administration which He has laid down, and which are, indeed, the perfections of his nature.

The inquiry naturally resolves itself into an exploration of the uses to which the Lord puts the instrumentality of man in his dealings with man's fellow-creatures ; his appointed instruments for the occupation of Canaan by the descendants of Abraham ; and an examination of the texts of Scripture which are supposed to enunciate his sanction of a depopulation of the land by the sword of the Israelites.

We see God's dispensations administered by man, his instrument ; for whose guidance He has laid

down positive commands, and has declared also the general principle of them, the same in all, to enable man his official, to carry them out in the spirit of them; man being an understanding agent, not a passive tool. Snow, and vapour, and wind, fulfil his word without knowing that they do so, but man knows his Master's will when he does it.

The institution and economy of a human agency, for the administration of God's moral government of mankind, are ordered so as to train up the creature from lower to still higher moral abilities by the practice of co-operating with the Lord in restoring a disorganized economy to order in this world; and to qualify the creature to exemplify and enjoy, in a better world, that order that reigns in heavenly places. Imperfection in administration is unavoidable where the instrument is such a creature as man. *It must needs be that offences come; but successive failures are, for an imperfect being, the only exercise leading to final success. Imperfection, in degree, may perhaps occur in every order of created beings: He chargeth his angels with folly.*

2. Where the creature is an inadequate instrument through weakness of faith or other infirmity;



or where the work which is necessary to be done is of those which the Lord has reserved to Himself, such as vengeance of which we read, *Vengeance is mine, saith the Lord*, the Lord acts by other instruments than man, and the result is a miracle. *It is the Lord's doing, and it is marvellous in our eyes.* In the incarnation of God the Son, and in all its exemplification, all is of necessity miracle. Not only was the work required to be done immeasurably beyond the limited area in which man's agency can act, but also all man's preceding instrumentality, as an agent for lesser good, had been neutralized by the evil that was in the world, or paralyzed through the infirmity and imbecility of the instrument. *The Lord saw that there was no man. . . . His own arm brought salvation.*

Christ revived and re-established the system of human co-operation with the Almighty in the dispensation of mercy: *We, as fellow-workers with Him*, saith the Apostle. And Christ, naming those attributes of the Lord which had been enumerated to man (because in some degree imitable by man), bespoke man's co-operation with God in applying them to the conditions of their fellow-men. He

proclaimed, in fact, the name of the Lord on the Mount of the Sermon as He had proclaimed it on Mount Sinai; that men might be perfect after the fashion of the perfection of the Father; and also pointed out the limits of the energy of man in co-operating with God; *Whatsoever ye would that men should do unto you, even so do ye unto them.* In fact the perfections of God proclaimed on Mount Sinai, mercy, grace, longsuffering, goodness, truth, forgiveness, are the substance of the Sermon on the Mount. The Apostles learnt from that discourse what were the weapons of those who would be instruments in carrying out the Lord's intentions. The Israelites had heard the same principles proclaimed from Mount Sinai.

The infliction of the life-destroying judgments of God's justice cannot therefore be included among those dispensations in which the Lord uses the instrumentality of man. He had indeed employed Moses as his instrument in all things necessary for the welfare of the people; but when severity and vengeance had to be administered, the Lord bade Moses stand aside, saying, *Let me alone, that I may destroy them* (Exod. xxxii. 10). In such cases the

instrumentality of man finds its only lawful exercise in interceding for those threatened ; as Moses did on the occasion above alluded to, and as Abraham did for Sodom.

Man, indeed, often crosses the Lord's purposes, and nullifies the corrective tendency of his judgments, by interfering and inflicting destructive punishments, the inventions of man's cruelty. Hence it is that we are told *the wrath of man worketh not the righteousness of God* ; and of such interference of man's cruelty in the Lord's schemes for dispossessing the Canaanites (which cruelty failed), the Lord saith, *Oh that Israel had hearkened unto my laws and walked in my ways ; I should soon have subdued their enemies* (Ps. lxxxi. 13, 14), in a psalm which has special reference to their migration from Egypt into Canaan.

We know that the Lord has often allowed the sword to inflict due punishment, but his allowing it is no proof of his making destruction one of man's lawful ministrations. Yet men, about to use aggressive war, have habitually adduced the Lord as commanding or sanctioning their ambition and cruelty ; as the King of Assyria, by Rabshakeh, arrogated to

himself a divine commission to destroy Jerusalem, but, as others have, found that they who take the sword perish with the sword.

3. We may the more boldly presume that the Lord did not make the twelve tribes instruments of slaughter for dispossessing the nations of Canaan because we find the Lord naming the instruments which He would employ. *I will send my fear before me. . . I will make all thine enemies turn their backs unto thee. I will send hornets before thee, which shall drive out the nations. By little and little I will drive them out* (Exod. xxiii.). Here we find the Lord employing irresponsible agents for the work, such as could not be demoralised by doing it. Having thus named Himself as the expeller of the nations, and having named his agents in the work; the Lord then assigns to the Israelites the agency in which they were to act; to destroy the idols, and to secure the expulsion of the nations by making no treaties with them, both duties tending to train them to true religion and to an uncontaminated life, a people of fellow-workers with God.

This conception, that the Lord intended the dispossession of the Canaanites to be effected with as

much mercy as his justice admitted, is confirmed by what we read of his temper towards them before He drove them out. Having promised Abraham that He would give their land to his descendants, He nevertheless kept them out of possession for four generations, for the sake of one of the nations, the Amorites, to whom He conceded the full measure of his forbearance with nations (Gen. xv. 6). This is the temper with which He dealt with them.

No mention is ever made, often as the promise of the land is repeated, of the sword as an agent in driving out the nations; and Abraham's descendants were by the Lord's providence secured from acquiring the usual warlike habits of tribes by being secluded in Egypt, where we find them labouring indeed in the brickfields, but not learning war in the armies of the State. As the Lord had worked in Egypt to extricate the people from Pharaoh's power, as He had worked in the wilderness to supply their wants, so would He work in Canaan in giving the people possession of the land. He Himself parted the Red Sea; He divided Jordan; the Egyptian pursuers were destroyed without the lift-



ing up of a sword against them; the walls of Jericho fell down without being battered or assaulted.

There had been a panic in Jericho, as the Lord promised should be the case; but the unbelieving among the Israelites caused spies to be sent into the town to ascertain the fact; but though some believed not, their unbelief did not make the faith of others ineffectual (Rom. iii. 3), and *by faith the walls of Jericho fell down.*

4. Then, however, man's violence crossed the path of the Lord's purposes, and we have to account for the fact that the Lord immediately withdrew. All was changed. In the next town, Ai, there was no panic; its people repulsed the Israelites, and it was subsequently taken by a purely military stratagem. Town walls fell down no more; there was no more panic; neighbouring tribes united for common defence.

Among the Israelites the delight in slaughter and plunder grew with the practice of it; so that Joshua with difficulty restrained the people from slaughtering the Gibeonites with whom they had inadvertently made a treaty of peace. His restraining

them shows that some efforts were made by the righteous few to moderate the passions of the majority ; proving to us that then, as in days of somewhat similar temper, there were some in Israel, like Nicodemus, who did not consent to the deeds of the majority, though those deeds might be sanctioned by the high priest. And undoubtedly the war and the slaughter and the plunder of the cities, though not first originated by the ecclesiastical authority in Israel, were suffered and sanctioned by the priests.

The rushing of the people to the slaughter of the inhabitants of Jericho must have shown the priests what the uncontrollable temper of the people was, and that they would lose all influence over them if they ventured to check it. *Thou knowest the people, that they are set on mischief*, was Aaron's explanation of the necessity of indulging the people by celebrating an idolatrous feast (Exod. xxxii. 22), and Moses acknowledged the irresistible force of the excuse.

Since Aaron, with the voice of the commandments from Sinai yet ringing in his ears, sanctioned and furthered the institution of idolatry as the only

means of pacifying a wilful people, we cannot wonder that the priests in Joshua's day, under the same influence, sanctioned war and slaughter.

5. The Rabbinical fabulists say, that the Lord having commanded every *zkr* of the Edomites to be destroyed, Joab took the word to be *zakar*, a male, and accordingly slaughtered all the male Edomites; but David rebuked him, telling him that the word was not *zakar*, a male, but *zeker*, a memorial, and that the commandment did not justify what he had done (1 Kings xi. 15).

The story has no doubt been invented to uphold the necessity of observing the Rabbinical vowel points, if we would understand Scripture; nothing more. But Joab's conduct is a very apt illustration of the habit of men who, commissioned by the Lord to discharge some duty, unhesitatingly put their own temper and spirit into the command, and execute it in the spirit of man, not of the Lord.

The Lord Himself has complained of man's carrying out his commandments in a cruel spirit, He not having contemplated cruelty; as when the Lord expresses his sore displeasure with the heathen nations who *helped forward the affliction*, when the Lord was

*only a little displeased with his people* (Zech. i. 15.) The heathens, instruments of his chastisement, having, through love of cruelty, destroyed, whereas the Lord intended them to chastise only.

So also when the ten tribes took an opportunity of invading Judah, the Lord by his prophet rebuked the cruelty practised, saying, *Behold, the Lord God was wroth with Judah, and delivered them into your hand, and ye have slain them with a rage that reacheth unto heaven* (2 Chron. xxviii. 9). *Wouldest thou, said the indignant Elisha to the blood-thirsty King of Samaria, smite those whom thou hast taken captive? Set bread and water before them* (2 Kings vi. 22).

And when, afterwards, Jerusalem was delivered into the hands of the Chaldees, as Jericho had been delivered into the hands of the Israelites, the Lord expected the Chaldees to treat the town mercifully, for He makes it a charge against them, *I gave them into thine hand, and thou didst shew them no mercy* (Is. xlvii. 6).

The law concerning men who fall into the hands of others, was laid down at the renewal of the race in Noah's days, *at the hand of every man's brother will I require the life of man*; that is, of a man who

falls into another man's hands. And the commandment from Mount Sinai was as comprehensive as it is plain, *Thou shalt not kill*. Even the nest of the bird was not given into the hand of the finder to do with it what was right in his own eyes, but with a plea from the Lord for mercy on behalf of the dumb creature, and with a precept enjoining commiseration (Deut. xxii. 6). For not a sparrow shall fall to the ground without our Father (Matt. x. 29).

The Lord delivered Jericho into the hands of the Israelites, and they slew the inhabitants in a temper which may well be described as a rage that reacheth unto heaven, and showed them no mercy ; conduct which the Lord condemns, and therefore could not have commanded. But it is as easy to account for the slaughtering of the Canaanites by attributing it to the habits of invaders and customs of war, as it is difficult to reconcile it with the precepts of humanity and of natural religion ; while it is impossible to reconcile it with the temper of the Almighty, or with his expressed law, and it is not difficult to show that the slaughterer was not justified by any special positive command of an exceptional nature from the Lord.



Men have ever had a besetting infirmity in understanding commandments from the Lord, suggesting zeal, as suggesting the use of carnal weapons; so St. Peter literally provided a sword, when our Lord said, *he that hath no sword, let him sell his coat and buy one*; and actually drew and used the sword, but was reproved in words that condemned all aggressive warfare; as Tertullian observes, “*Omnem postea militem Dominus in Petro exarmando discinxit,*” (de Idol. xix). *The Lord disarmed every soldier, from that time forth, when He disarmed Peter.*

Tertullian says, *postea*, but what our Lord disapproved of for the future, He cannot have approved of in preceding ages.

St. Stephen distinctly teaches us that Moses considered himself commissioned by the Lord to deliver his countrymen from persecution, *he supposed that his brethren would have understood how that God by his hand would deliver them* (Acts vii. 25; Heb. xi. 25), when, at the age of forty, he renounced a courtly life for the task of delivering his nation. But the deliverance of the Israelites was delayed for forty years by Moses making use of carnal weapons and violence, attempting to discharge his office by slaying

the Egyptian who was smiting a Hebrew. Forty years of humiliation as a shepherd taught the once self-sufficient courtier to distrust his own fitness for the work, and the use of carnal instruments in performing it. But by these he at first thought that the Lord intended it to be accomplished.

Man entrusted with corrective power, usually and naturally exceeds the limits of his commission, by adding severity, and substituting the destruction for the chastisement of those against whom he acts.

It was therefore but natural and human for the Israelites in general to suppose that because they were to have possession of the land, they were necessarily to invade it; and that because they were to dispossess its inhabitants, that therefore they were to slaughter them. Nothing but an acquaintance with the nature of the Almighty, and his intentions towards his creatures, could have preserved them from this carnal view on the matter. But the forty years which they spent in the wilderness had not tutored them as the forty years which Moses spent in the wilderness with Jethro had tutored him.

To measure the punishment inflicted by the fault committed, and to mould punishment into correction,

are conceptions of which man naturally seems incapable; he acquires them more or less according as the revelation of God's nature acts on his. The declared moral condition of the twelve tribes precludes our supposing them capable of having, or of appreciating, such true conceptions. Only thus can we account for their slaughter of the Canaanites. If they ever thought of the instructions which they had received on the matter, we can still somewhat understand their proceedings, by observing that they must have interpreted the Lord's words in the most bitter sense of which his words could possibly be made capable, and have understood expulsion to mean extermination.

6. Interpreters have done the same with the written text in translating it, often selecting the bitterest possible meaning for a word by which no bitterness was intended; and readers and hearers have helped on the bitter meaning in some places; for so our Lord's sigh, "Alas for thee, Chorazin!" *Woe unto thee, Chorazin!* is unhesitatingly accepted as a denunciation and a threat.

When we consider how some words in Scripture have been transmuted by the translator's craft so as

to make them breathe out threatenings whereas they do but foretell or bewail calamity to come, we are disposed to think that the complaint, *every day they wrest my words* (Ps. lvi. 5), was made concerning such expounders of the Lord's sayings. The authors of the English version have been unhappy in this respect, especially in the New Testament, in their use of the word *damn*, which, as we may see from Shakespeare, had in their days the extreme meaning which it now has. Their excuse is, that they wrote in (Vulgate) Latin, in which *damnare* means to convict; and generally where the Vulgate had *damno*, they wrote *damn*. This their inveterate failing led them into so translating the latter part of 1 Cor. xi., that, according to them, St. Paul tells us that a *Christian*, communicating unworthily, incurs *damnation*, in order that he may not be *condemned* with the *world*. The Corinthians unworthily communicating, St. Paul tells us, had been visited with sicknesses and premature deaths, chastisements intended to correct them, lest they should finally be condemned with the wicked. The authorised version says that they had eaten their own *damnation*; and this is a very striking and instructive instance of the manner in

which the Lord's *corrective* dispensations have been represented as *destructive*, by the sleight or awkwardness of translators. We shall find this exemplified in the translation of those passages in which the Israelites were instructed as to their treatment of the nations whom they were going to dispossess.

It is true that there are precepts, concerning war and the sacking of towns, so expressed that their meaning cannot be misunderstood ; and they allow the people a license equal to that indulged in by the invading hosts of Alaric or Attila. These precepts are found in Deuteronomy, in which book also we find the precept concerning divorce, which our Lord said was not in the beginning, and was suffered, and a precept concerning it written by Moses, *for the hardness of the people's hearts*, that is to say, on account of their inveterate obstinacy in putting away their wives.

As these statutes concerning war are not found *in the beginning*, we must class them with that concerning divorce, as contrary to the Lord's will, but forced on the legislator by a violent race, who had forced the worship of the golden calf on Aaron, and had



once threatened to stone Moses if he did not contrive to gratify them (Exod. xvii. 4).

Isidorus tells us that Deuteronomy was reckoned anciently by some not to be one of the books of Moses. The reason for this opinion may be gathered by our finding inserted in it the statute of the kingdom made by Samuel when he anointed the first king, Saul (Deut. xvii. 14), of which we are expressly told *Samuel wrote a book* (draft), *and laid it up before the Lord*; that is to say, in the place where the sacred rolls were kept.

If that statute was in existence before Samuel wrote it, he could not have declared the people's desire for a king to be a sin against the Lord, it would have been simply carrying out the law.

That statute of the monarchy (Deut. xvii. 14—18), and not the whole law of Moses, is the law of which every newly appointed king was to make a copy, *mishna*, for his guidance in governing himself in the kingdom. The book Deuteronomy itself was known as *Mishna*, because it contained copies of various statutes; but the bulk of the book gives as evident proofs of its being by Moses, as Cæsar's Commentaries give of their being the work of Caius Julius.

The speciality of the statutes of war in the Pentateuch is an increasing license, gradually conceded more and more; all history proves that such growth in callousness and license is the inseparable result of a long-continued indulgence in war. Accordingly, we find, that at the taking of the first city captured, Jericho, there was slaughter, but no plunder; at the taking of the next city, Ai, slaughter and plunder, the priests stipulating for a share.

The slaughter in the cities of the five kings detailed (Josh. x.) is justified (ver. 40) by appeal to the statute (Deut. xx. 17) commanding the destruction in such case *of all that breathe*. Those statutes of war are not even headed by the formula, *The Lord said*, the import of which will be inquired into in a subsequent essay; and we are justified in classing them with the ordinance concerning the division of the spoil which *David made a statute for Israel* (1 Sam. xxx. 25), but which does not appear among the statutes, circumstances not permitting David to ensure its enrolment by laying it up before the Lord. The spirit, however, of this statute is found at Num. xxxi. 27.

And yet statutes such as of divorce and war had

some good in them ; the one ensured justice to the woman and imposed some restraint on the man ; the other suppressed the universal custom of mutilating captives, and putting out their eyes. The East must be measured by the standard of the East ; but the intrinsic morality of statutes by the standard of God's moral laws. Mercy, in the East, is but qualified cruelty ; in all lands it is but suppressed retaliation ; in the Lord alone it is a spontaneous excellence, *over all his works* ; bad men who cannot enjoy it yet cannot exclude it altogether. It entered even into the ordinances of divorce and war, *statutes which were not good*, which the Lord suffered the wilful to have. *I gave them also statutes that were not good* (Ezek. xx. 25). They were allowed, only because a state of things had prevailed which, humanly speaking, the moral law had not contemplated.

But it is evident, that as the statute of divorce was not made in anticipation of discord between man and wife, but after it had begun to prevail, and had broken the sanctity of marriage, so these statutes of war were made, not as preparatory to ordained war, but after that, by war, the command thou shalt not kill had been cast away. *In the beginning it was not so.*

## X.

1. Specialities of the Hebrew moral temperament.—2. The peculiar position and condition of the people in the wilderness.
- 3. Futility of the claim of the nation to military successes.
- 4. Commentators.

1. THOUGH in the Hebrew race the human creature appears more highly organized than in any other, of most acute perception and fertile in deductions when anything was presented to it for observation, it has contributed nothing to any exact sciences, because in the pursuit of them the mind has to proceed from many doubts to some certainty; and the Hebrew mind was incapable of doubting. Extreme in all impulses, the Israelite proceeded on an unquestioned conviction that what he did was right; for he did nothing without declaring that he did it in the name of the Lord, and seldom delivered an opinion without prefacing it by the formula, *thus*

*saith the Lord.* He knew that the Lord acted and spoke by men of his race, as by no other race, and the individual assumed as his own every privilege exemplified in members of his race.

Such a race required to be fearfully impressed with the truth, and severely schooled in what was right (for which purposes the wilderness offered the best field) ; for if they chose the good they were certain to adhere to it more strenuously than any other race ; if the evil, they would be equally energetic in it.

With the same unhesitating constancy with which their progenitor Abraham renounced his country and adhered to his self-expatriation, with the same his descendants rejected Christ, and persevere in doing it.

St. Paul gloried in stoning St. Stephen, never doubting that he was doing God service ; he gloried still more afterwards in being stoned himself for the faith which Stephen had preached ; in both cases extreme in whatever opinion he held.

2. But our present subject is not that race as it was when trained and put in power, but the wayward childhood of the Jewish people, whilst the whole mass was undergoing the test of probation, Massah, in the wilderness.



The peculiar phraseology of the English version in naming the wilderness days *the day of temptation*, and in describing the people as having there *seen great temptations*, has been already accounted for. It is peculiarly unhappy as suggesting a wanton exposal of the people to temptation, than which there cannot be a greater misconception of the ways of the Lord.

*Massah*, from *nissah*, to test, means *probation*, the proof of the thing tried. *To see great temptations*, represents Hebrew words meaning *to undergo searching tests*. *Meribah* is the struggle between the subject of the ordeal and the agent in it.

We are, when with the people in the wilderness, present at the first outbreak of evils and errors which became afterwards inveterate in the nation ; and also at the first suggestions of truths, and germs of good qualities, which afterwards developed themselves in the race.

We may form some opinion of the religious and moral condition of the tribes and hordes that were threatening the Canaanites from the description of their ways given by Moses, *We do here, this day, every man what is right in his own eyes* (Deut. xii. 8) ;

when he warned them that such a state of things could not be tolerated when they had settled in Canaan. Moses referred to their irreligious habits. The world has not yet seen a moral irreligious people; the description, therefore, includes their moral conduct, which must have been such as to necessitate much legislation neither contemplated *in the beginning*, nor intended to be permanent after they had become a settled nation.

The nation, then, was without form, and void, and darkness covered it. Unless this is borne in mind we shall be found calling some darkness in their opinions, light, and some evil in their practices, good, and temporary concessions to the infirmities of some, laws of perpetual obligation to all.

Many transactions at which Gospel-taught humanity revolts, and some of those statutes which were not good, may be accounted for by analyzing the mass of the migration from Egypt to Canaan. Statutes that tolerated or mitigated evils were not necessitated by the obedient. *The law*, saith St. Paul, *was not made for a just man; but much was added because of transgressions.*

The general corruption of the people in the wilderness, which however was not universal (for *not all who came out of Egypt* incurred God's displeasure, Heb. iii. 16; 1 Cor. x. 5), originated apparently in that *mixed multitude* of camp-followers, slaves of various races, African and Shemitic, who with their families followed their Hebrew masters, and of numerous half-breeds, the offspring of Israelitish mothers by Egyptian fathers.

It is very probable that these dissociable components of the mass were held together by the necessity of camping near the only source of water supply, given out by the rock at the word of Moses, not once only, but at every station, for St. Paul tells us that it *followed them* (1 Cor. x. 4), which must mean, that, wherever they were, there was the water-giving rock; its outflow, *spiritual* to the spiritually minded, *common* to the carnal.

It was among this multitude that discontent broke out and spread to the Israelites (Num. xi. 4). The first culprit put to death was the son of an Egyptian father and Israelitish mother (Lev. xxiv. 10). These were the strangers within the gates for

whom the Lord claimed the consideration of the Israelites. Most of them could be admitted to citizenship in the third generation.

Judging from the objection of Aaron and Miriam to Moses's living with a Cushite wife (Num. xii. 1), some such social commotions must have occurred on the way to Canaan as occurred on the return from Babylon, when *the mixed multitude* gave trouble (Neh. xiii. 3), and the son of the high priest was excommunicated for marrying the daughter of Sanballat (ver. 28).

Thus we may see that there were all the elements of confusion, turbulence, fighting, and plundering, as well as examples of various idolatries, round and among the Israelites in the wilderness, who were but too ready to imitate the examples set them. Also among the pure-blood descendants of Abraham, some caste-like distinctions seem to have obtained. The people classed themselves as Hebrews and Israelites; the distinction is obscure, but it certainly existed. Even St. Paul claimed the privilege of being *a Hebrew of the Hebrews* (Phil. iii. 5), as he also claimed that of being a Roman citizen. And the broad division of the twelve tribes into two

confederacies, Judah and Israel or Ephraim, is of the date of the exodus.

Hence we may obtain some notion of the various bodies of men who journeyed through the wilderness: one headed by the star of their god Remphan; another by the shrine of Moloch; whilst others followed the Tabernacle of the Testimony (Acts vii. 43). But, even of these latter, Scripture gives us such an account, that the faithful among them were probably to the indifferent in the same proportion as they have ever been in the Christian Church.

From Numb. xi. 4, 5, we learn, that contempt for the manna and craving for delicacies originated with the mixed multitude, and from them spread to the children of Israel; and from Exod. xvi. 15, that the people had their choice between the flesh of the quails in the evening and *bread to the full* (manna) in the morning.

It is most consistent to believe that the few faithful abstained from the quails' flesh, and confined themselves to the manna (as Daniel confined him to clean food at the Babylonian court); whilst the worldly-minded and godless surfeited themselves with it, sickened, and died; and that the class which



*loathed* the manna in the wilderness loathed the mild processes of God's dealings with the Canaanites, and lusted for blood as their fathers had lusted for flesh, and with the same result, their own shame and destruction ; whilst the faithful and enlightened abstained from war, bloodshed, and plunder. That there ever have been such, who have followed after peace and ensured it during the most evil and disastrous condition of a commonwealth, Boaz and his life, full of light and sweetness in the dark and bitter times of the judges, proves to us.

As regards the son of Nun, he is the David of the infancy, as the son of Jesse was the David of the manhood, of the people. It is not more difficult to conceive that the man, who brought the cluster of grapes from the valley of Eshcol, crucified the five kings at Makkedad, than to believe that the hands which taught the harp to sound forth the Psalms, taught the sword to slay in war ; for the exigencies of a man, burdened and hampered with the government of a people, are as productive of inconsistencies as is the temper of a nation. Moses forfeited his lot in Canaan by what he did to propitiate the people ; and David missed the honour of building

the Temple because, as a chief, he was obliged to be a warrior. Some who have appeared to be leading armies are, in reality, being driven to war by the people which follow them.

Scripture may take no more special notice of the faithful in the wilderness than it does of the seven thousand faithful in Israel in the days of Ahab. But we discern them in those who testified with Joshua that the Lord had failed in none of his promises to them; and who set up the Tabernacle at Shiloh (Josh. xviii. 1); the unfaithful, in those who failed to dispossess the tribe that used iron chariots, and the Jebusites, and lived mixed with the Jebusites (Josh. xv. 63), whom the Lord had expressly promised He would expel, but who held their ground till the time of David, and are honourably commended in the person of Araunah the Jebusite.

At the unopposed passage of the Jordan, and at the procession round the walls of Jericho, the whole emigration were assembled to witness the miracle. But we observe that for expeditions such as that against Amalek and the Midianites, and against Aï, volunteers appear to have been employed; no selec-

tion by lot is mentioned. Any one can estimate the class that would volunteer.

What suggests itself is, that we may be very much mistaken if we suppose that statutes, made necessary by the turbulent and heterogeneous components of the camp in the wilderness, were statutes for the faithful in Israel, or that they reflected the mind of the Lord. They only reflected the evil in certain classes of men to check it from proceeding further. It is not difficult to dwell on the whole subject until we say of the invading tribes, *their glory is their shame*; and of the men who formed the armies which ravaged Canaan, that they were the outcasts of the people, who set up each his favourite idol wherever he obtained a footing.

The invasion opened with a great success; the walls of Jericho fell down before a sword was drawn. Then the sword came into play, with these results, that, after all the fighting, seven tribes are enumerated as having failed in driving out the Canaanites; and had to make terms with them contrary to the express commandment of God (Judges i.); and the Israelites ended by intermarrying with six, at least, out of the seven nations, and adopting their religion

(Judges ii. 5) ; and they who had taken the sword perished with the sword.

But there was a spark on the altar at Shiloh ; there was a godly seed dwelling among the reprobate, as Lot dwelt in Sodom ; *except the Lord had left us a very small remnant, we should have been as Sodom*, was true of many crises in the history of Israel ; and it was not until after many centuries, when war at last had burnt itself out, and a king who had never made war sat on the throne, that the Lord returned and dwelt among the people. Since this was so, who can have commanded all the wars that had been waged to be undertaken ?

3. One speciality of the dispensation under which the Israelites lived was, that obedience and success were synonymous, for the cross had not then been laid on the faithful ; so that if war had been an act of obedience, it must have been successful in their hands. But no gleam of success, here and there, can dazzle the reader, so as to prevent his seeing that the aggressive wars of the Israelites were disastrous to them, and their defensive wars, throughout their history, futile. The interposition of the Almighty, with means other than those of

war, saved them from destruction on such occasions.

Whether it has arisen from the wording of a version which describes the depopulation of the canton of Judah, as *making THE EARTH empty* (Isa. xxiv.); or from the impression produced by the partiality of the Church, hitherto, for lessons descriptive of combats, to the neglect of others, such as those of the Book of Ruth, which exemplify peace in Israel; or from the industry of commentators who are thought to be expounding Scripture, whereas they are only amplifying a version of it; popular opinion assigns to the Jewish arms a glory and extent similar to that of Assyria and Rome, and the military annals of the Jews are exhibited as though they were the record of the vocation of the people.

It may be difficult to form a worthy estimate of the dominion which the moral law, given to the Israelites, acquired in the world; but this at least we know, that from Judea, through the mouths of the Nile, the principles of equity and the awfulness of law were diffused over Europe, and produced the classical theories of government and society; as the precious products of the East, through the same



outlets, diffused ornaments and luxuries throughout Greece and Rome.

But an estimate, more moderate and just than that due to popular reading, of the extent and effects of the Jewish conquests and wars, may be obtained by reflecting, that they were a people in whose ideas the world to be conquered was the land that lay between the Euphrates and the Levant; beyond which limits their conception of the globe did not extend; and that their efforts at conquest or self-defence were too insignificant to leave one trace which the curious Herodotus could discern, who, by his silence concerning them, fulfilled the prophecy of Balaam, *the people shall not be reckoned among the nations*, in one sense (Num. xxiii. 9).

It was not any right understanding of the Lord's intentions or desire to adhere to his commands, but precedents such as that supplied to them by the Edomites in invading Seir, which governed the twelve tribes when they entered Canaan. *The Horims dwelt in Seir aforetime; but the children of Esau succeeded them, when they had destroyed them from before them, and dwelt in their stead, as Israel did unto the land of his possession, which the Lord gave*

them (Deut. ii. 12). A passage which must have been inserted in Deuteronomy as a gloss (for the bulk of that book was written before the Israelites invaded Canaan), and in which Esau is likened to Jacob in the matter of obtaining possession of a land for himself.

But Esau had been promised a land which he was to acquire by war, *thy dwelling shall be the fatness of the earth, and by thy sword thou shalt live* (Gen. xxvii. 40); but Jacob had been promised a land which the Lord should give him (Gen. xxxv. 12). In the statement, that the Israelites had recourse to the same methods as the Edomites in getting possession of a land, the promised divine interposition is acknowledged. And no doubt this was the popular view, and actual state, of the case; but it was not the view which the faithful took of it, nor the method which the Lord intended.

We view, therefore, their military invasion of Canaan as due to an ineradicable ignorance, or misconception, of their vocation, and we class it with Saul's folly in establishing a standing army, and David's blindness in viewing the people, given to him to govern, as a nation of fighting men set under a warrior.

4. It seems but respectful to commentators, on suggesting a view of a question so opposite to that which has found favour with expositors, to notice some of the positions, mostly gathered from Jewish sources through Poole's Synopsis, which they take up in order to defend the most startling infractions of God's moral law by the invading twelve tribes.

The arguments adduced by expositors to support their approbation of all the deeds done in that invasion have been almost universally adopted by those who have made the history the subject of sermons. Hence it has prevailed among those who are more or less conversant with the Bible history as set forth in the authorised version.

The prime argument, stripped bare, is, that the Lord commissioned the Israelites to break the sixth commandment from Sinai, *Thou shalt not kill*. Or, at least, that He granted them a dispensation, valid for a certain time against certain nations, dispensing with their observance of it. They do not tell us when the Lord reinstated that commandment.

As regards the details of the cruelty, some commentators would have us believe that the massacre of "smiling infants" cannot be approved of, but

cannot be altogether regretted, because their salvation was not only expedited, but secured by their premature deaths.

They who have heard the cry of Rachel weeping for her children, a cry proceeding from the depths of nature, but re-echoed from the lips of inspiration, and they who know the Lord as one who gladly found one excuse for not destroying Nineveh in the fact that it was full of artless children, can scarcely be expected to listen with equanimity to such reasoning; for in such arguments men controvert, as decidedly as the blasphemer does, all that we know and believe of the principles and methods of the Lord.

The killing of men and male children, and of mothers and married women, and the reservation of young girls by the Israelites *for themselves*, is supposed to have been allowed, in order to teach the Israelites to restrain their lusts; and merely to supply them with women servants (Scott and Henry on Num. xxxi.).

This opinion is contrary to the customs of the East, which are elsewhere largely drawn on to illustrate Israelitish habits; slaves made in expeditions

invariably became concubines in the East. The Iliad is founded on a quarrel for a slave concubine.

Such comments as those above noticed have driven rash men to reject Scripture, and thoughtful men to go to seek the Hebrew original for light; as the corrupt traditions of the mediæval Church made bad men persecutors, and drove good men to the original Greek of the New Testament for the truth.



## XI.

1. Hebrew texts examined.—2. *I will destroy all the people.*—3. *Thou shalt smite them and utterly destroy them.*—4. *Anathema.*—5. *Nor show mercy unto them.*—6. *I will cut them off.*

1. WHEN we take up the Hebrew record of the instructions to the Israelites with respect to the Canaanites and their land, the text offers no difficulties, if read without the prompting of interpreters. The Hebrew speaks of the Lord as the agent in clearing the land ; and of his instruments, panic and noisome creatures ; and as strictly charging the Israelites to have no dealings with the Canaanites, to make no treaties with them, or intermarriages which might occasion their remaining in the land, thereby corrupting a devout people. War and the sword are never mentioned, for the Lord undertook to drive out the Canaanites. A stern interdict, or anathema, was to keep the Israelites and Canaanites apart. And the greatest

stress was laid on the immediate and total annihilation of idols.

A different version, converting the instructions into orders to an invading force, has been forced upon the original, by ignoring the object in view, disregarding the context, and fetching from any distance distorted meanings for plain words.

When we turn to the very Hebrew text of the directions given to the Israelites concerning the people which they were going to dispossess of their land ; if we approach the translation of it with the notion that we are about to read instructions given to his people by one who was encouraging the people to break the sixth commandment instead of observing it, as service done to Him ; and was carrying out a system of training the people adapted to make them a destroying power upon earth, blunted in their hearts against sentiments of compassion, as the great Napoleon trained his people ; then, certainly, if a word we meet with in the text can by any possibility be pressed into the service of urging men to bloodshed, we must, at all hazards, give it that meaning. If we have a choice, for instance, between deriving *hamôthi* from *hamam*,

to alarm, or from *moth*, death ; we shall prefer the latter, if our object is to intensify the sense of exhorting to slaughter.

But if we approach the text remembering that we are about to read and enter into the sense of the commandments of a Lord who, having made man in his own image, forbade man to deface that image by shedding man's blood (Gen. ix. 6) ; by a Lord whose first commandment to man respecting his neighbour is *thou shalt not kill* ; who, when He came in person, said that He had come to save men's lives, not to destroy ; by a Lord who professedly had adapted his providence in such wise as to train up the Israelites to forbearance, by setting them an example of it ; and to be a holy people unto Himself ; and who gave the Land of Canaan to them expressly that they might have a place in which they would have free scope to keep his statutes ; if this is our notion of the Lord and his ways, then, we cannot conscientiously write *utterly destroy* or *destroy* or *cut off* (with the sword), as the meaning of words which more naturally mean *excommunicate*, *put out of sight*, *drive off by fear*, or *separate*.

To gratify the Jewish national pride in war, we

must translate such words as justifying all the horrors of war. But to maintain consistently the character of the Lord, as He has appeared up to that time in Scripture, we must understand them in a sense alien from that of war.

2. The crucial passages are such as the following, Exod. xxiii. 31: *I will deliver the inhabitants of the land into your hand, and thou shalt drive them out before thee. Thou shalt make no covenant with them.* This is correctly translated, only we must know that *deliver into your hand* means put at your disposal.

The Lord promises to put the Canaanites at the disposal of the Israelites; and they were to banish them, for, *they shall not dwell in thy land lest they make thee sin against me.*

But at ver. 27 of this chapter, the English version has, *I will send my fear before thee, and will DESTROY, hamōthi, all the people to whom thou shalt come.* According to this version, at ver. 31, they are to be driven out; but at ver. 27, according to the same version, they are to be destroyed by a panic; now a panic does not destroy, it does drive off.

The Hebrew word *hamam*, whence *hamōthi*, means

to *strike with terror*, to *trouble*, and so the English translators translated it (Exod. xiv. 24), when the Lord sent his fear on the Egyptians crossing the Red Sea in pursuit of Israel. *The Lord looked unto the host of the Egyptians, and troubled, yahom, their host, so that the Egyptians said, Let us flee.*

It seems hard, in the face of this parallel passage and of the context, to describe a panic as *destroying*; but the English translators cannot have looked at the Hebrew, nor at the Septuagint, for it has ἐκστήσω, *I will displace*. St. Jerome writes *occidam, I will kill*; his excuse must be that he probably thought the word *hamöthi* was derived from *moth*, *death*.

3. The next important passages to be noticed are to be found Deut. vii.; the contents of which chapter, in the Vulgate and in the authorised version, strangely mock the heading prefixed to it in both, viz., *all communion with the nations forbidden*. This is a correct heading of the first part of the chapter, if the Hebrew is consistently translated; but the versions, despite their headings, make the chapter say that the nations are to be *slaughtered*.

The Vulgate leads the way to this meaning, say-



ing (ver. 2), *percuties eas usque ad internecionem, thou shalt smite them with indiscriminate slaughter*; the English version follows it, saying, *thou shalt smite them and utterly destroy them*.

The Hebrew has *hachărem thachărim, thou shalt strictly excommunicate, interdict, or ban them*. This common Hebrew idiom, and these two very words, are exactly reflected in *ἀναθέματι ἀναθεματίζειν*, (Acts xxiii. 14). Such was to be the treatment of the nations by the Israelites. But the idols, not the nations, were to be utterly destroyed; so the Hebrew says concerning the idols, *abbed theabbedon, thou shalt utterly destroy*.

The versions ignore the distinction, which the Hebrew text distinctly enunciates in special terms, between the treatment of the nations and that of the idols by the Israelites. Those versions misrepresent the Almighty as commanding no distinction to be made between *men*, made in his own image, and *idols*, images made for worship.

The word *charem*, translated *to destroy*, in the place under consideration, is generally pronounced in the East without the initial guttural, *harem*, and is of universal use, being applied to things which

are *not to be destroyed*, but, set apart from their common or usual use, and relegated to some special use or condition, *one vessel unto honour, and another vessel unto dishonour* (Rom. ix. 21); as St. Paul expresses the effect of diverse dispensations, whilst reasoning on the election of Isaac, and setting aside, *charem*, of Ishmael; the preference shown to Jacob, and excommunication, *charem*, of Esau (*profane Esau*, Heb. xii. 16).

The Apostle then applies the expression *vessels* set apart *unto dishonour*, to certain nations once separated from the *vessels* set apart *unto honour*, by what he elsewhere calls a *wall of partition*. This was the decree of *charem*, excommunication (executed by the act of expulsion) against the seven nations, ἔθνη, Gentiles.

This could not have been a decree of *destruction*, for the Apostle declares that, according to Scripture (Hos. i. ii.), and on the principles of God's moral government, their reprobation could be removed; and that it was annulled by Christ, the Mediator; and is done away in Christ, the Body (see Eph. iv. 14). We find some instances where *charem* makes a thing a *vessel unto honour*; and also others where it makes a thing a *vessel unto dishonour*.

The area of the Temple at Jerusalem is, at this day, called a *haram*, because it is a *τέμενος*, cut off from the common building-ground of the city, like the piece of land contemplated in the statute (Lev. xxvii. 21) described as a *charem* devoted (God's acre), not to barrenness, but to be the glebe of the priest. *The field shall be holy unto the Lord, as a field devoted, charem; the possession thereof shall be the priest's.*

At Lev. xxvii. 8, we read, *None devoted, charem, that shall be devoted of men, shall be redeemed, but shall be put to death.* The words *devoted of men* must mean *some man devoted*, for though the words *of men* are ambiguous, and may mean *by men*, yet the Hebrew prep. *min*, never brings in the agent or instrument; the text, also, must refer to forfeited human life, for the phrase *moth yimath, put to death*, is applied exclusively to the death of man, never to that of animals.

This precept has been faintly suggested as authorising the execution of prisoners taken in war, a practice common among heathens; though, the love of lucre being often stronger than the love of blood, captives were usually sold as slaves.

Elisha recoiled from the thought of killing a prisoner, *Wouldest thou smite those whom thou hast taken captive with thy sword and with thy bow?* (2 Kings vi. 22). He wondered that even a worshipper of Baal could conceive such an atrocity to be lawful. If we do not listen to the prophet's exposition of God's laws, we are like the Israelites, and it is no wonder if a Jewish view of the Old Testament satisfies us.

The precept, no doubt, refers to the execution of a convicted criminal; who could not be ransomed.

The formula of the *charem* laid on a criminal was, *thy blood is on thine own head*, that is to say, *you are answerable for your own death*.

As the implacable Caiaphas had unwittingly uttered prophecy, in saying, *it is expedient that one man should die for the people*, so the thoughtless mob unconsciously fulfilled prophecy when they inverted the formula of this *charem*, saying, *his blood be upon us* (Mat. xxvii. 25), for our Lord had foretold concerning all righteous blood shed, *it shall be required of this generation* (Luke xi. 51).

The maxim, *no one of the human race* (*ha-adam*, not *ish*, Heb.) *who shall be devoted, yachoram, shall be*

*ransomed* (Lev. xxvii. 29), when thus rightly understood, as applying to a malefactor sentenced to death, leads us up to understand St. Paul's words of Christ, who, *being numbered among the transgressors, was made a curse, κατ'άρα, charem, for us* (Gal iii. 13), which made his ransom from death impossible. He accumulated humanity in his own person, and so made Himself a *charem*, one devoted, and such a one *shall not be ransomed, he shall surely be put to death*. And to this our Lord alluded when he said, *for their sakes I DEVOTE* (ἀγιάζω, *charam*), *myself* (John xvii. 19), or sanctify myself, as we read, *πάν ἁνάθεμα ἄγιον, every devoted thing is most holy* (Lev. xxvii. 28).

When the Apostle quotes the saying, *cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree* (Deut. xxi. 23), and applies it to Christ; we observe that he does not accept the Septuagint version of the saying, *cursed of God is every one, &c.*; he omits the words, *of God*, though the Hebrew has *elohim*; and for this reason, that the words *qilēlath elohim*, mean *attainted by the judge* (see page 180), not *cursed of God*, as the English version has it.

The precept commands the burial of the male-



factor's dead body ; claiming for it all the decencies and proprieties of sepulture, *thou shalt, in any wise, bury him that day* ; for, in hot climates interment must take place very speedily, for sanitary reasons, *that thy land be not defiled*, and for ceremonial cleanness' sake, in the case of the Jewish people ; for an *ill savour* defiled ; and for that reason Martha objected to the opening of the grave of Lazarus, then four days dead.

Sepulture was always a proof of compassion, and the precept stipulated and ensured that man's passion, in punishing, should respect God's compassion, and that *the remainder of wrath*, man's vindictiveness, *should be restrained* (Ps. lxxvi. 10), that no indignity, such as casting the body to the dogs, should be offered to the dead body, for justice had been satisfied.

This law of compassion was not observed in the case of the savage execution of the sons of Saul (2 Sam. xxi. 8) by the Gibeonites ; and Rizpah's conduct in watching by the dead, till at last they were buried, was no less in accordance with the law of God than with the dictates of affection.

The Old Testament Scriptures are valuable only

as applicable to Christ. If we take the Septuagint to have rightly translated *galēlath elohim, cursed of God*, we must contradict St. Paul, we must detest the action of Joseph of Arimathea, and Nicodemus, in not simply burying, but in embalming also and honouring, the dead body of one who *hung on a tree*; for if the Jewish Septuagint understood the passage rightly, they honoured that which God had cursed.

But the Apostle has shown us how the Spirit ought to translate the Old Testament; and, in doing so, has left a loud warning to the Church not to trust the Jewish Greek Septuagint, but to translate the Old Testament for herself by the Spirit which she has, and which they had not. By an ignorant interpolation of the words, *of God*, after *cursed*, they, in the place cited, have vitiated a text of crucial value when applied to Christ. He was, indeed, *cursed* (sentenced) by Caiaphas and Pontius Pilate, but he was accepted of God. If Melancthon had said, *Judaismus redolet*, instead of *Philosophiam redolet*, *quicquid omnino commentariorum exstat*, he would have been right, as far as the Old Testament law is concerned.

4. In addition to the reasons already adduced,

it may be added, that we cannot understand *charam* to involve the taking of life, unless we maintain that persons excommunicated and banned were necessarily to be put to death ; in fact, that a sentence of anathema is a sentence of death. An excommunicating anathema repels and sets apart those with whom the Church has no commission to deal further than by excommunicating them. They are therefore set aside for the Lord to deal with.

The Lord gave authority to his Church to bind and loose persons and things on earth, promising to ratify, in heaven, her decision. But our Lord gave no authority to his Church to bind and loose things in heaven. When the Church declares that such and such persons will perish everlastingly, because they do not accept her doctrines, she speaks unadvisedly with her lips by going beyond the limits of her *anathema*, which does not reach beyond the temporal into the eternal state. *The Father hath committed all judgment to the Son.*

Few will endorse the opinion given in the notes to the Rhenish Bible on Rev. xviii. 24, that the blood of heretics, put to death for their tenets, will no more be required of ecclesiastical judges than

will the blood of murderers be required of civil judges. It was the doctrine of the Inquisition, but never that of the collective Church, that those whom the Church excommunicated the State should put to death; and that doctrine infected anti-Papal Christendom for a time. A more enlightened Christendom, and a more humanised age, have declared it to be a custom *nec nostri seculi, et pessimi exempli, abhorrent from our age and of pernicious precedent*, which words of Trajan place the Papal Roman Inquisition lower in morality than the Imperial Roman Inquisition.

It is abhorrent also from the laws of God, and it is only by disregarding his expressed intentions concerning the Canaanites, the avowed principles of his legislation, the context of Scripture, and the direct meaning of its word *charam*, that the Scripture can be made to say that the Lord commanded the massacre of the anathematized Canaanites.

It was a delusion of the Israelites, of which the Lord may say, *I never commanded it, neither came it into my mind, i.e., never intended it to be done*, as He saith in several places (Jer. vii. 31, &c.) of another delusion of the Israelites, the offering of their first-

born children to Moloch, by passing them through fire.

This practice existed in Israel from the days of Moses down to the captivity, and was ineradicable. The terms in which the Lord deprecates the practice are such as show us that, like the massacre of the Canaanites, it was thought to have been sanctioned by Him.

This infatuation arose from a misunderstanding of a precept, *the first-born of thy sons shalt thou give unto me* (Exod. xxii. 29), and from their combining it with a traditionary, not written, account of the offering of Isaac by Abraham, in which, probably, they were taught that Abraham kindled the wood (*behold the fire and the wood*) before he laid Isaac on it (see Gen. xxii.)

They considered that sacrifice as introducing a custom of perpetual observation; they called the Deity, *Moloch*, that is to say, *King*, and passed their children through the smoke of kindled wood, as an initiatory rite dedicating them to him. *I never commanded it, neither came it into my mind*, the Lord said repeatedly.

The Lord would not have said, *I never commanded*



it, if the general opinion had not affirmed that He had done so. We have then an instance of an opinion concerning the Lord's will and intentions, inveterate in the race, and so regarded, that kings, even of Judah, Ahaz and Manasses, practised it, and yet utterly incorrect. With such evidence of the misconceptions of the Jews before us, it is natural to believe that they would believe and maintain that the Lord commanded the massacres in Canaan. If it is said, that, if it were so, we should find the Lord disclaiming the imputation, there could be no object in his doing so, for it was not a continually repeated custom; and because if the Lord ever had forbidden a sin, He had forbidden bloodshed.

It is presumed that if verse 2, Deut. vii., does not direct slaughter, by the words *hachărem thakărim*, there cannot be found any justification for those who claim the sanction of the Lord by the lips of Moses for the massacre at Jericho and elsewhere. It is therefore important to examine the words fully.

The whole verse in question reads in the authorised version as follows: *And when the Lord thy*

*God shall deliver them before thee, thou shalt smite them, and utterly destroy them; thou shalt make no covenant with them, nor shew mercy unto them.*

*The Lord shall deliver them before thee*, is a sentence which gives an uncertain sound; *the Lord shall set them before thee*, would be a translation quite in unison with a frequent translation of the same words in the authorised version; whereas *deliver* has the sound of delivering to the sword, followed as it is by *smite and destroy*.

It might be thought captious to notice that the Hebrew has not *and when*, but simply *and*; but it is impossible not to object to the gratuitous insertion of *and*, so as to make of *smite and destroy* two actions; for the Hebrew has, *thou shalt smite them, nacah, anathematizing thou shall anathematize them*. The smiting and anathematizing are not two, but one. The words are found (2 Mal. iv. 6), *Lest I smite, nacah, the land with a curse, charem*; and hence we see that the *smite, nacah*, has not in this place the meaning of *smiting with the sword*, but the meaning which the word has when applied to smiting with blindness, pestilence, madness, astonishment, &c. (Deut. xxviii.); and in

the expression, *smite him with the tongue* (Jer. xviii. 18), meaning *defame*.

Also the meaning *destroying* or *slaying*, is inapplicable to the commandment in the place under consideration, because, *when the Lord shall deliver those nations before thee, thou shalt drive them out*, is the distinct command (Exod. xxii. 31); and because the immediate context presupposes their continuing to exist by forbidding any contrivance for keeping them with them in the land.

5. Our version says, *nor shew mercy unto them*, a revolting injunction. The Hebrew word, translated *mercy*, is *chan*, which means *a favour requested or granted*; but *mercy, compassion*, is *chased*, not *chan*, in Hebrew; as in the text, *I desired mercy (chased), and not sacrifice* (Hos. vi. 6). The truest translation of the passage is that of Montanus, *neque præstabis eis gratiam*.

The Hebrew means, *nor grant them any favour*, which is part of every interdict; but *to show no mercy* never is any part of one of God's commandments concerning man's dealing with man.

These texts have been thus closely examined to show that only by an unnatural and exacerbated

translation of Hebrew words, and by ignoring the context, can the Lord be represented as giving directions that the Canaanites were to be slaughtered by the Israelites.

We have no concern with any destruction which the Lord Himself inflicts on nations ; the question for us is the employment of men to inflict destruction on other men ; and it is complicated by the consideration that the nation who are said to have been set to the work were being trained unto holiness. Scripture would never have been charged with representing the Lord as encouraging bloodshed if translators had not daubed the Hebrew text with the untempered mortar of their interpretations.

6. At Exod. xxiii. 23. The Lord, after enumerating the doomed nations, is represented as saying, *I will cut them off*. The Hebrew literally means *I will make them disappear, I will put them out of sight, hikchadtiu*. Which might be done either by expelling them or by slaying them. The translator or interpreter, therefore, has to decide on a positive import to affix to the word. If he submits the decision to the Jewish lawmen and Pharisees, as all translators hitherto have done, he must understand

the slaughter of the nations to be meant ; if he submits it to the Lord, the Lord will tell him that their expulsion is meant, referring the translator to his numerous consistent declarations on the subject, and to his intentions, as in the context.

The English versions therefore may be justified if we suppose it to use the term *to cut off*, in this place, in the sense in which it is used in the expressions, *that soul, shall be cut off from Israel ; I would they were even cut off that trouble you* (Gal. v. 12), where it means *excommunicated*, or put out of office ; this meaning being supplied from the Apostle's directions as to putting away offending members ; just as the meaning of *I will put out of sight* is supplied by the assertion *I will drive them out*, which would be better rendered *I will drive them away, garash ; drive them out of your sight* (Josh. xxiii. 5), reflects the promise, *I will make them disappear*.

Nor in places where Moses says that the Lord will *cut off* those nations (Deut. xii., xix.), using the word *karath*, which means *cutting off* as a limb is cut off, can we positively assert that Moses implied their destruction by the sword. If we so decide from the inherent force of the word *karath*, we must



also assert that the sentence *that soul shall be cut off* (*karath*) *from Israel*, and a *deed of cutting off*, *sepher, krithuth, libellus excidii*, as Pagninus translates it, imply the infliction of death; whereas the one is expulsion from communion and nationality, the other a bill of divorcement, putting away a wife.

If no interpreter can avoid some bias in translating, it is surely safer to derive that bias from a prejudice in favour of consistency on the part of the Lord, than to borrow it from the minds of interpreters, commentators; for instance, from those who could write, *sin makes God rejoice in the destruction of his creatures* (Henry and Scott on Deut. xxviii. 63), in the face of God's declaration that the necessity of destroying man by the flood *grieved Him at his heart*.

If any commentary has been sanctioned by the English priesthood, it is the one which explains the Old Testament in the spirit of the preceding quotations. Can the Church wonder or complain if men, who think a commentary is *Scripture written plainly*, stagger at such things?

## XII.

1. No direct instructions to use violence given by the Lord to Joshua.—2. Formula peculiar to a direct divine communication.—3. Formula when the communication proceeded from a priest.—4. Means supplied to the priest for obtaining direction.—5. Urim and Thummin.

1. JOSHUA received direct information from the Lord concerning the way in which the Lord would deprive the inhabitants of Jericho of their defences. The Church in Israel was to co-operate by faith, and the walls were to fall down before the expressed faith of the people.

In the Lord's instructions the equipment of the priests and Levites was particularly detailed; but no mention whatever is made of any military equipment, nor of the employment of armed men and arms. On the walls falling down, every man was to go up to the dismantled city. It was given into their hands. David estimated man's habits rightly

when he chose pestilence or famine rather than to fall into the hand of man (2 Sam. xxiv. 14).

This instruction as to the taking of Jericho is the last direct communication from the Lord to Joshua. The Lord, who till then had been with him, appears to have departed from him; not without some cause, as he departed from Saul, when Saul had *done foolishly*.

From that time Joshua was directed by the priest whom he consulted. It will be the object of this essay to show how it is concluded that all slaughter and plunder were sanctioned by the priest, not by the Lord.

This conclusion seems, at first sight, untenable, because we read, *The Lord said unto Joshua, "Thou shalt do unto Ai as thou didst unto Jericho."* Upon which we may observe, in the first place, that Joshua did not do to Ai as, by the Lord's command, he had done to Jericho. The walls were not compassed by the people, headed by the priests with their insignia. But what the Lord did *not* command to be done to Jericho, to exterminate its people, was done to Ai.

We cannot close our eyes to the fact that after

the slaughter at Jericho (whether in consequence of it or not, we are left to judge), the conduct of the invasion passes out of the spiritual into the carnal phase. It ceases to be providential and supernatural—it becomes military and ordinary. Miracles cease, and craft comes into action. The assault on Ai fails, and recourse is had to stratagem to take the town. The operations differ in nothing from those of Alaric or Attila's hordes; and though the sanction of the Lord is claimed, we know that Attila claimed to be the scourge of God; and of many deeds done in the Lord's name, in the professed service of God, by the twelve tribes in Canaan, the Lord may say, *They laid to my charge things that I knew not of*: among other things, using the Lord's name in putting Achan's children to death for their father's sin; which the Lord forbids (Deut. xxiv. 16, collated with Josh. vii. 25). At this point in the history we already find ourselves among a people ignorant of God's ways, or neglectful of them.

We read, *the Lord said unto Joshua, thou shalt do unto Ai as thou didst unto Jericho*. The attempt made, such as it was, failed; it might have

been known by this that they had not done what the Lord desired, for we read, *When a prophet speaketh in the name of the Lord, saying the Lord saith, if the thing follow not, it is the thing which the Lord hath not spoken, but the prophet hath spoken it presumptuously* (Deut. xviii. 22.) Hence it follows that the prophet might *say* what the Lord had not spoken, the prophet speaking without direction, and of his own impulse.

2. Wherever it is written, *The Lord spake* (*dabar*), *saying*, &c., we must understand a direct communication from the Lord. But wherever we read, *the Lord said* (*amar*), there was no direct communication (unless a vision of the Lord to the person addressed is recorded), but a messenger is reporting something which, according to him, the Lord had spoken.

But when we read, *God said*, or *the Lord God said*, or *God spake, saying*, &c., we must understand that the Lord Himself is the speaker.

The crucial word in the Hebrew indicating a direct communication\* is *dabar*, λαλεῖν, to speak; but where *amar*, λέγειν, to say, only is used, a direct communication is not positively asserted.



If Moses, instead of writing *God said, let us make man*, and *God blessed the seventh day*, had written *the Lord said, &c.*, and *the Lord blessed, &c.*, the Hebrew would have understood that some one, commissioned to speak and bless, had done so in the Lord's name. This is why the word Lord, *Jehovah*, is not found in the narrative of the Creation.

If the directions to Joshua had been immediately from the Lord, the Hebrew scriptural diction would require it to be expressed by "the Lord spake (*dabar*) unto Joshua, saying," &c., or "the word (*dabar*) of the Lord came to the prophet, saying," &c. The prophet is called, *nabi*, *he who speaks out*, for he was to declare the word or matter (*dabar*) which the Lord imparted to him, *put into his mouth*.

The peculiar Hebrew formula is observed by the evangelists, *e.g.*, τὸ ρῆθεν ὑπὸ τοῦ κυρίου διὰ τοῦ προφήτου λέγοντος, what was *spoken* by the Lord, who, through the prophet, *said, &c.* (Mat. i. 23); and (Acts xxviii. 25) τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον ἐλάλησε . . . λέγον, *The Holy Ghost spake, saying*; where the ἐλάλησε *spake*, in the formula *spake saying*, indicates the personality of the Holy Ghost.

Besides the words *dabar*, actual utterances by

the Lord, and *amar*, reporting what was said; the word *neum*, translated *said*, but meaning *affirmed*, has, in the Hebrew, a special and intense significance.

This word *neum*, *saying*, is never found combined with *dabar* or with *amar*, and is never applied to express man speaking, but is exclusively reserved to express *the Lord said*;\* and is the special word for all specially solemn utterances, such as, *By myself have I sworn saith (neum) the Lord. The Lord said (neum) unto my Lord, Sit thou on my right hand (Ps. cx. 1).*

The word may be said to be peculiar to prophets, as *amar* is to priests, in declaring what the Lord had spoken. It is logically related to *neëman*, faithful, and so to *amen*, true, which leads us to conclude that the solemn ἄμην λέγω, *verily, I say*, translates and represents the solemn *neum*, *I affirm*. St. Jerome says that the ἄμην λέγω, from our Lord's lips, is an equivalent to the ancient Hebrew affirmation

\* The only exceptions to this general rule are, *Balaam said* (Numb. xxiv.); *the son of Jesse said*, David's last words (2 Sam. xxiii. 1; Prov. xxx. 1); and where the Lord rebukes false prophets for abusing it (Jer. xxiii. 31).

made with the formula, *As the Lord liveth*. St. Paul paraphrases it, as E. Castell remarks, by πιστὸς ὁ λόγος, *what I say is true (this is a faithful saying, E. V.)*

Much is lost to the student of Scripture, in translations, by the translator's neglecting to note *diversities of operations* by using a special word for each, as the Hebrew does.

As the word *dabar*, *spake*, implies a communication directly imparted, Scripture says, *The Lord spake unto the fish* (Jonah ii. 10), not, the Lord said to the fish; for there was no *medium* speaking for God; it was the directing impulse of the divine nature on a lower nature, like the impact of the sound of a word on the ear.

A direct commission, implying the divine origin of all that a prophet said, is asserted by the prophets of the Old Testament, once for all, by the record that "the word (*dabar*) of the Lord came to them." We observe this also in the case of the commission to John the Baptist, *the word of God*, ῥῆμα τοῦ Θεοῦ (not λόγος), *came unto John, the son of Zacharias, in the wilderness* (Luke iii. 2). But the second person of the Trinity is spoken of as the λόγος, not ῥῆμα,

and the Chaldee observes the same distinction by using the word *memrah* (from *amar*, λέγειν), not (*dabar*), ῥῆμα.

We must, in all cases, look to the language of the original, and, if we do not find the word *dabar* used concerning injunctions, we must understand that they proceed merely from men in authority.

3. We conclude that the formula, *the Lord said*, means that some one, having authority by his office to speak in the Lord's name, said what is recorded, as the formula, *God shall judge him* (1 Sam. ii. 25), means some one having authority to judge shall judge.

That the former class of officials sometimes spoke in terms implying instructions, but without directions, to speak, is stated (Ezek. xiii. 7), *Whereas ye say the Lord saith it (amar), albeit I have not spoken (dabar)*. That those called *gods*, because judges for God, sometimes judged unrighteously is plain from Ps. lxxxii., where gods are rebuked for having *set all the foundations of the earth out of course*, by abusing their office. Which psalm our Lord quotes as applying the word *gods* to men commissioned by God, adding οὐ δύναται λυθῆναι ἡ γραφή, *that text cannot be disputed*.

Whilst on this topic, we cannot but recall to mind the conscientious caution of St. Paul in giving spiritual direction. *Unto the married. I command, not I, but the Lord. . . . to the rest speak I, not the Lord.* Yet the Apostle asserts his inspiration, *δοκῶ δὲ κατὰ πνεῦμα Θεοῦ ἔχειν* (1 Cor. vii.) And ver. 25, *Concerning virgins I have no commandment of the Lord, yet I give my judgment*, “being one who has mercifully been made trustworthy by the Lord,” *ἡλεημένος ὑπὸ κυρίου πιστὸς εἶναι.*

Since no exception can possibly be taken to our translating *God shall judge, by the judge shall judge*, there seems no valid objection to our translating *the Lord said by the prophet or priest said.* We need not hesitate to do so because the Rabbin have fabled that the word Jehovah, Lord, was too holy a word to be ever uttered. We know that, on the contrary, it was a word of such common utterance that it entered into innumerable idiomatic expressions of hourly use.

That men in authority would speak in the Lord's name without having been instructed what to say, is evident from the words, *ye say, the Lord saith, whereas I have not spoken* (Ezek. xiii. 7) addressed



to the prophets of Israel, and stamped as directly from the Lord by the formula, *The word of the Lord came, saying, &c.* (ver. 1).

We also read, *the prophets prophesy falsely, and the priests bear rule by their means, and my people love to have it so* (Jer. v. 31). For as our Lord tells us, *they spoke well of the false prophets* (Luke vi. 26). The Old Testament nowhere uses the term *false prophet*, those, so spoken of by our Lord and by the Apostles, were not the pretending prophets of Baal, but prophets *in sheep's clothing*, lawful yet faithless, who prophesied smooth things and deceits in the Lord's name to suit the temper of the people.

What Hananiah saw Jeremiah suffer for speaking the true word of God, and what he saw the king and people longed and loved to hear, induced him to prophesy, in the fourth year of the captivity, the return within two years of the royal family and vessels of the Temple from Babylon. But though he prophesied without instructions, he did not presume to say, as the English Bible makes him say, *the Lord speaketh, dabar*, but *the Lord saith*, according to the Hebrew. (Jer. xxviii. 2.) *Then said the prophet Jeremiah unto Hananiah the*

prophet, *The Lord hath not sent thee (i.e., commissioned thee); but thou makest this people to trust in a lie* (ver. 15).

Instances need not be multiplied to show that the use of the formula, *thus saith the Lord*, indicates no more than the utterance of the priest or prophet; either without instructions from the Lord, or with them; the Hebrew Scriptures always giving a note of an actual direct instruction from the Lord; and where that note is omitted, making us understand that what was said was from the priest or prophet. The record, therefore, that *the Lord said unto Joshua*, &c., is the record of what the priest said unto him; and this is the more certain because there is no record of any direct communications from the Lord from the days preceding the taking of Jericho for four hundred years till the Lord resumed them in the days of Samuel; and the writer of the record of the death of Moses tells us that since the time of Moses till the time when he was writing, there had not arisen a prophet whom the Lord *knew face to face*, or, as it is expressed in 1 Sam. ii. 1, *there was no open vision*, nor had been for a long time, till *the Lord revealed himself to Samuel by the word (dabar) of*

*the Lord*, ver. 21, where that word, *dabar*, implying a personal communication, reappears in Scripture, after having been withheld for four hundred years.\*

4. If any are disposed to think that it was a thing so perilous as to be incredible that the people should depend for guidance on spiritual authority so liable to misdirect them, it must be remembered that the priest was supplied with means appointed for obtaining direction from the Lord, or for ascertaining that the Lord refrained from giving an answer to inquiry made of Him.

In the priest and prophet we have an exemplification of the administration of truth by the agency of man, a fallible and imperfect instrument; but the order and method of God's moral providence requires it to be so administered on earth. The necessity and wisdom of it will be justified in due season.

From many indications in Scripture we may perceive that men in authority to speak for the Lord, and commissioned by the Lord to speak for Him, needed to use circumspection, as well as means of grace, before speaking for Him. Moses, because he spoke while yet angered and provoked in spirit,

\* On this subject see Essay xiii.

when he smote the rock *spake unadvisedly, battah*, which word is used by our Lord in directing men how to pray, *μὴ βατταλογήσητε*, He said, bidding us not pray without fit preparation of mind and language.

Michaiah, irritated by the sight of an idolatrous king of Israel surrounded by pretending prophets, called for a harper, that his playing might help to still his human indignation, that he might not speak unadvisedly when speaking for the Lord. None had more need than the prophet to pray, *Set a watch, O Lord, before my mouth, keep the door of my lips*, when about to exercise the office of man speaking for the Lord, whose utterances would be recorded as what the Lord said, and who, therefore, by speaking unadvisedly might lend the sanction of the Lord, in the minds of the people, to iniquity. Yet, as Simon de Muis observes, the Jewish authorities had the habit of prefacing any assertion which they made on any subject by the formula, *Thus saith the Lord*. This was an habitual *taking the name of the Lord in vain*, in the true sense of that commandment.

Conscientious priests waited the Lord's pleasure instead of answering unadvisedly and rashly; and

the inquirer waited to see whether an answer would be given. So Doeg, coming to consult the Lord through Ahimelech, the priest, was *detained before the Lord* (1 Sam. xxi. 7), not having received an answer; and no wonder, his subsequent conduct shows us that he was of those to whom the Lord said by the prophet, *I will not be enquired of by you* (Ezek. xx. 3).

Similarly we read *Saul asked counsel of God*, through the priest, as appears from the preceding verse, *but He answered him not that day* (1 Sam. xiv. 37), nor ever after, it would appear. Saul sought in Jonathan's conduct, after making inquiries, the cause of this failure, as the priest laid the blame of his failure before Aï upon Achan's fault. *Ut nemo in sese tentat descendere, nemo!*

5. It is probably from the practice of the wizards of the East, who employ polished surfaces in their art, and by looking into them pretend to see things concerning which they are consulted, that some have tacitly borrowed the notion, that the brightness or dimness, or other physical conditions, of the jewels on the priest's ephod-breastplate, guided the priest in his decisions, or in the directions which he ought to give.



The English Bible, by not translating the words *Urim* and *Thummim*, has invested them with even more obscurity than must necessarily attach to ancient things long out of use.

In the blessing of Levi by Moses (Deut. xxxiii. 8), *Let thy Urim and thy Thummim be with thy Holy One*, should be, *on thy compassionate one*. *Urim* means *lights*, as in St. James's words, *every perfect gift cometh down from the Father of Lights*; i.e., all *Thummin* from the author and giver of *Urim*.

The judge or priest, when consulted, either gave the answer of judgment in the words of the written law *al pi hattorah* (Deut. vii. 11) *at the mouth of the law*; or if the matter did not come within the purview of the law, the priest answered according to the *Urim*, *enlightenment* (Numb. xxvii. 21), and this answer was *Thummim*, *a final, or perfect, decision*. So (2 Sam. xx. 18) *they shall surely ask counsel at Abel, and so they ended the matter, hithammu, settled and decided it*. And (1 Sam. xiv. 40) Saul, when about to cast lots to decide who was in fault, said to the Lord, *Give thummim, i.e., a final decision*.

The priest, when consulted, was bound to put on, not the linen ephod, but the ephod which had

on it the precious jewels. In this vestment the priest could speak for the Lord. It is called *an ephod and teraphim* (Judges xviii. 14). Abiathar having fled to David with *an ephod in his hand*, David was enabled to ask counsel of the Lord, and said to Abiathar, according to our version, *I pray thee bring me hither the ephod* (1 Sam. xxx. 7); but for many reasons we must understand that David requested Abiathar to *put on* the ephod, that he might inquire of the Lord. For David was distinguished from Saul as being a man who would not invade the priest's office as Saul had done, but would be a man after God's own heart, *i.e.*, a man who would observe the Lord's intentions concerning religion.

Such was the solemnity appointed when the priest was to speak for the Lord. If men in authority carelessly or wilfully neglect the instruments with which their office is to be made effectual, as a high priest would if he did not put on the ephod and remember the institution of the Urim and Thummim, when attempting to speak in the Lord's name, it cannot be expected that he would receive the Lord's direction. Because, if those appointed means

had been unnecessary, they would not have been instituted.

It has been observed that, at first, Joshua, in a vision, received instructions directly by the Lord as to how Jericho was to be taken (Josh. v. vi.), but no directions either as to sending spies into the city or committing any slaughter in it. After the slaughter no direct communication to Joshua is recorded. It may reasonably be inferred that the use of carnal means and violence had caused the Lord to withdraw the privilege of direct intercourse with him.

In this event Joshua would have no other source of direction but that given through the priest. Joshua, indeed, at his appointment was restricted to receive instruction from the priest, *He shall stand before the priest to ask counsel for him after the judgment of Urim, before the Lord* (Numb. xxvii. 21).

A priesthood, such as that in Israel then, who had failed to enforce even circumcision among the people for a whole generation, or to prevent the multitude from worshipping Moloch and Remphan, was not likely to have influence sufficient to debar the people from the usual practices of invading hordes. The

fear of man bringeth a snare sometimes on the best men. The delight which the people took in slaughter and plunder (they longed to slaughter even the Gibeonites, Josh. ix. 26) must have made it dangerous for the priests to thwart their desires. If they yielded to the pressure, and sanctioned slaughter from considerations of expediency, they did no more than Aaron did, who proclaimed a feast before the golden calf for fear of offending the people, who were *set on mischief* against any one who did not sanction their vices and pander to their passions.

It is abundantly evident that the tribes on entering Canaan were influenced by the passions common to all invading tribes, and whether the priests shared in the general feelings or not, they were not unlikely, as Aaron did, to sanction with the customary formula of authority what they could not prevent, and to say, *Thus saith the Lord, thou shalt do unto Ai as thou didst unto Jericho*, though the Lord had not spoken.

We have no reason to suppose that the times of the invasion were more religious than those of which the Lord said, *The prophets prophesy falsely, and the priests bear rule by their means, and (for)*

*my people love to have it so* (Jer. v. 31); or than those times when, as we read, the prophets used to say, *The Lord saith, albeit He hath not spoken* (Ezek. xiii.).

We have an instance when those who sat in Moses' seat, being questioned on a matter of faith, allowed their fear of the people to influence the answer which they gave. *If we say of men, all the people will stone us* (Luke xx. 6).

The Crusades, the counterpart of the Israelitish invasion of the land, were sanctioned by the highest ecclesiastical authority of the times, and entered on to the cry of *id Deus vult, Dieu le veut*, God will have it so.

Our Lord warned men that some would think they did God service, enforcing his will, by putting Christians to death; and what He foretold was exemplified by a *priest* in his own case, for the Jewish high priest, speaking as the mouthpiece of the law of the Lord, said of Christ, *By our law He ought to die*, words which were equivalent to, *Thus saith the Lord, He ought to die*.

Thus it appears in accordance with evidence as to man's temper and acts, to believe that ecclesiastical



authority would bend to the times, and sanction war in the Lord's name.

And that a speciality in the Hebrew diction justifies us in affirming, that he who wrote in the records of those times, *The Lord said, thou shalt do unto Ai as thou didst unto Jericho*, so expressed himself without any suspicion that readers, Hebrews, would suppose him to mean that God spake and said it; because, to prevent that misconception, he avoided using the word *dabar*, which would imply the Lord's sanction, and merely used the word *amar*, which, every Hebrew, in the days when he wrote, knew did but imply an instruction from the priest.

## XIII.

1. The morality of the invasion of Canaan judged by its consequences.—2. Eclipse of the priest's office as the medium of Divine direction.—3. The subsequent fortunes of the dispossessed nations.

1. THOUGH the Lord sometimes *holds his peace* when men carry out their evil intentions, we are warned not to think that therefore the Lord is such as they are; and so, though it is true that no disapprobation of the treatment of the Canaanites by the twelve tribes is found expressed in Scripture, nor, we may observe, of Herod's massacre of the infants at Bethlehem, nor of the rebellion of Absalom, nor of the incest of Lot's daughters, this peculiarity in Scripture is not to be reckoned a proof of approbation. Scripture teaches the character of a deed by its consequences, as Providence, the nature of an agency by its results, and as

nature, the quality of the tree by its fruits. Where such things are apprehended beforehand by faith, experience in time confirms the judgment of faith.

If it is said that the two last instances above adduced needed no reproof because natural religion of itself condemns them, it must be answered that for the same reason the slaughter of the Canaanites needed not to be reproofed, for natural religion condemns it; it offers the very instance where natural religion revolts at the supposed sanction of a deed by inspiration. So that, it being so repugnant to natural religion, its authors were judged out of their own mouths. But the approbation or disapprobation of it, as of many other acts, may be ascertained from an express declaration of the Lord to the effect that the practice and habits of war disqualify and disentitle a man from founding his Church, which undoubtedly was the mission of the Israelites.

No doubt their fanatical devotion to idolatry, as it wrecked their hopes of peace in the land, also put their establishing the Lord's Church out of the question and out of their thoughts. But we may also inquire whether, supposing they had not adopted idolatry, they could have been qualified and per-

mitted, after the blood they had shed, to found the Church of God.

We can judge only from the case of David, who, unlike them, was honoured with the title of *the man after God's own heart*, because he was the king who was wholly free from idolatry; and yet even he, because he had finished the wars which the twelve tribes began, and in so doing had shed much blood, was adjudged unfit to build the Temple. Such is the Lord's condemnation of war and bloodshed. They who have charged the slaughter in Canaan on the Lord have *charged God foolishly*; that the opinion was popular among the ancient Jews is not astonishing; they had other opinions concerning the Lord equally dishonouring Him.

An ancient and general popular opinion is no trustworthy interpretation either of the intention or precept of a lawgiver, but is generally an exposition of a ruling delusion. It is generally stubble unworthy of the foundation on which it is built; for every delusion has some truth hidden under it.

As regards the military invasion of Canaan by the Israelites, because it actually took place, and because it supplied the popular literature of the

people with themes, and flattered the national pride, men made the Lord the author of it, and unwittingly sacrificed the good name of the Lord to establish that of the heroes of their legends. Having to face the true and inspired history of the events, they interpreted them as confirming their own opinions.

The Lord spoke of these slaughters beforehand by the prophetic lips of the dying Jacob, *Simeon and Levi are brethren, instruments of cruelty*; and foreseeing that His Holy name would be blasphemed by being implicated by men in their violent doings, He said, *O my Soul, come not thou into their secret; unto their assembly, mine honour, be not thou united!* (Gen. xlix. 6.)

2. The invasion of Canaan was also followed by a remarkable eclipse of the priesthood. After it, the priest is supplanted, as God's minister, by the non-Levitical civil judge. *God gave them judges for the space of four hundred years.* And when the priest appears again, in the person of Eli, he is not of the family of Phinehas, it had sunk into obscurity, but of the family of Ithamar.

It is given as a reason for the lawlessness of those



times, that there was no king in Israel: the more remarkable fact is, that there was virtually no priest in Israel. We can account for this only by conceiving that the priest had been grossly unfaithful to his office.

This obliteration of the priest, the promised and appointed guide of the people, after he had made their feet swift to shed blood, is one of the most remarkable occurrences in the Old Testament Scriptures.

Experience in the recorded ways of the Lord teaches us that punishment is inflicted by the withdrawal of the special privilege which has been abused. The privilege which the priest abused was the privilege of speaking in the Lord's name, when he commanded human agency to be substituted for Divine interposition in dealing with the nations to be dispossessed.

No direct communication from the Lord is recorded, no *dabar*,\* after that the priest, speaking *unadvisedly*, encouraged bloodshed at Ai, such as had been at Jericho, unable to foresee that the first

\* The only apparent exception is Josh. xxii. 1, where the commandment given to Moses is quoted.

attempt would ignominiously fail, incapable of promising that the walls of Ai should fall as did those of Jericho. Human agency stepped in at his word, Ichabod was written on the Ephod, the glory departed from the priesthood.

We know, from the case of Eli's sons, that the Lord removed the priesthood from one family to another for unfaithfulness. As we find that a king takes his signet from an officer, on finding that he had used it to give effect to ordinances contrary to the king's intention ; so the Lord took away from the Jewish priests the privilege of speaking *with authority* in his name, because they had abused it. He afterwards again intrusted it to Samuel, having found in him a faithful priest.

Though the priests, soon after entering Canaan, set up the tabernacle at Shiloh, not only have we no instance of the Lord's appearing to them, or even answering them there, for nearly four hundred years, but we are even distinctly told that in Eli's days *there was no open vision, the word of the Lord was precious, unattainable*, it had been so since the wars in Canaan : and it is recorded with something like thankfulness that the Lord revealed Him-

self again to Samuel by the word (*dabar*) of the Lord.

Joshua, or whoever he was, who added to Deuteronomy the narrative of the death of Moses, laments that from the death of Moses to the time when he was writing there had been no prophet in Israel who, as Moses did, enjoyed *open vision*, *saw the vision of the Almighty*, or *knew God face to face*, as it is variously expressed. This statement proves that that portion of Deuteronomy was written before the days of Samuel, for it is exultingly recorded that to Samuel *the Lord appeared again by open vision*, which till then for some undefined period had not been the case: from the statement in Deuteronomy we learn that it had been wanting from the death of Moses.

After perceiving that throughout the days from Moses to Samuel, the Israelites received no communication from the Lord, being left to follow their own hearts' lusts as their chastisement; the books of Joshua and of Judges acquire importance as records of what even a chosen people may become when spiritual guidance is withheld, and ecclesiastical guidance substituted for it.

Fearlessness in recording the truth is the great mark of Scripture : uninspired historians of a people, whom they at the outset had declared to be a holy people unto the Lord, must have suppressed such things as we read in the Scriptures. But also no uninspired writers could have produced those flashes of truth which, like sheet lightning during an insurrection, reveal the evil of the deeds doing, without being contaminated or interrupted by them. Below, all seems man's will and man's violence having its own way, but from above come *thunder, hailstones, and coals of fire*. And in the byways of life into which profane history never enters, we meanwhile catch glimpses of characters such as Boaz, Hannah, Barzillai and Obadiah ; the meek possessing the earth which the violent thought they were monopolizing.

The result of a national conduct teaches us the morality of it far better than the opinion of the people themselves does. The issues of the invasion of Canaan were altogether disastrous to the Israelites. The Lord withdrew his presence from them for four hundred years, during which there was no open vision. The directions they received from a priesthood

whom the Lord had abandoned were such as that which sanctioned the extermination of a brother tribe, that of Benjamin, by the others. The judgments on the Canaanites had not taught them the lesson which it could have impressed on them, if they had stood still and seen the salvation of the Lord, whilst He drove the people out before them ; but they, having attempted it by cruel means, had learnt habits of cruelty.

From the destruction of the Canaanites the Israelites certainly learnt no profitable lesson on the fate of idolaters ; it had no more effect on them than the yearly reading of the tenth chapter of Joshua has on the Church ; the last thing that occurs to the hearer of that chapter being, *except ye repent ye shall all likewise perish.*

The fate of Saguntum and of Carthage excites commiseration in the historian who records it, and in the reader of his narrative ; but Jericho and Ai have never been pitied ; men seem to have supposed that their people were sinners above all people of their times because they suffered these things. Yet though Jeremiah describes Jerusalem as equal even to Sodom in wickedness, he lamented over her desolation.



3. We seem to have taken over something of the self-righteousness of the Jew from having taken over their view of the Scriptures. But if we follow the subsequent history of those banished nations, we find that the Lord did not lose sight of them; they became the *goin* of the Hebrew, the *ἔθνη* of the Greek Scriptures, the Gentiles, *the islands of the sea*, as distinguished from the heathen, *the ends of the world*; and Judæa stood midway between the heathen eastward, *the uttermost parts of the earth*, and the Gentiles westward, *the isles of the nations*; as the censer of Phineas between the dead and the living; and the light of life ever spread from the east westward towards the Gentiles, for the Spirit of the Lord ever yearned after them, and Isaiah turned to the Gentiles as decidedly as St. Paul did.

The expelled nations went westward, chiefly into the settlements of Japhet; and with Japhet at last have come to dwell in the tents of Shem; and have inherited the place of the rejected Jews; being put in possession, *not by arms, or by power, but by my Spirit, saith the Lord of Hosts* (Zech. iv. 6).

Westward the banished nations of Canaan went, and became the Gentiles, and the Gospel followed

them westward : eastward, among the heathen, on the contrary, it has never gone forth conquering. Greece, remembering the source of its culture, called her earliest civilizer Cadmus, from *Cadam* the ancient East. They carried the old language to Carthage and long preserved it there. It is true that they carried their idols with them, but they carried also into lands of utter darkness some sparks of the truth which had been scattered among them from the altars at which Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, had worshipped whilst strangers and pilgrims among their forefathers. The embers of truth were never completely smothered under the ashes on which idolatry fed : flashes came from them at times as from Homer (of the seed of Javan), when he wrote “the gods listen most readily to him whose hands are clean,” which Isaiah expresses *I will not hear ; your hands are full of blood*. And that which Cicero acknowledges, and Horace made his own in the line, “*Oderunt peccare boni virtutis amore*,” and that spark, “we are his children,” which St. Paul snatched out of the pages of Aratus and blew into a flame with the breath of faith, when, turning to the Gentiles, he preached Christ and the resurrection at Athens.

Under the influence of the arts and letters, which they carried with them, the rude speech of the children of Japhet was moulded into the flexible languages in which St. Paul wrote his persuasive epistles, and in which St. Augustine, borrowing his diction from Cicero, wrote of the city of God. As the cedars grew on the wild heights of Lebanon, no one knowing for what purpose the Lord had need of them, and came at last into his service in the construction of the Temple at Jerusalem, so the human intellect grew strong among the Gentiles and became fruitful in appliances which the Lord at last gave to his Church as the precious spoils of vanquished idolatry, He having promised her that she should *suck the breasts of the Gentiles*.

So true it is that the expelled nations (whatever their number was) were followed by the Gospel and accepted it, that we find the Caphtorim migrating to the Nilotic delta, and there acquiring the name of Guptæ (whence Egypt, in the language of Herodotus); for the Pharaohs were kings of the Misraim, a race of the children of Ham, not of the Egyptians; and of the Caphtorim came the Coptic Christians, from whom we have

received the most precious manuscripts of the Scriptures.

Similarly, the Cushite pushed first southward towards the site of Mecca, and afterwards, migrating westward into the opposite lands of Africa, became the people known as the *Leucæthiopes*, white Ethiopians of Pliny, and the Abyssinians of the present day. The eunuch whom Philip instructed was of Cushite race. The Abyssinian Church obtained the Old Testament by translation from the Syriac Peshito. They of Tyre and Sidon colonised Carthage, and Tertullian and Augustine were born, and St. Cyprian officiated among the descendants of the Phœnicians.

Westward also the daystar of righteousness moved, over the Scriptural West the evening glow of the day of salvation will be seen; for the Christian era is the afternoon, *the two evenings* of the ages the last times; of which Zechariah prophesied, saying, *it shall come to pass, that at evening time it shall be light* (xiv. 7).

It fared ill with the intellect that was in the Church, so long as it loitered in the libraries of Alexandria, and dallied with the Shemite-Greek

literature of the age of Mystic Thaumaturgy : literature which the early fathers of the Church thought sufferable only as an indulgence ; as the fair heathen captive had been suffered to be retained as a concubine by the intractable Israelites (Deut. xxi. 11).

Greece gave to the Church *the pen of a ready writer*, and showed her the groping of earnest minds, having no light, after truth. Even Justin Martyr thought the earnest Plato to have felt after the doctrine of the Trinity (Apol. lx.). The Church would have been happier if she had never enlisted the sophistry and the Stageirite among the defenders and enunciators of dogmas. But the fascinations of the Greek literature withdrew the Church from the study of the stern and plain-speaking language of Moses and the prophets ; no one after Origen studied Hebrew ; but the Ilissus mingled with the Jordan, as the old Orontes with the ancient Tiber.

The Roman literature, more practical and less speculative than the Grecian, had a more wholesome influence on Western Christendom through men like St. Jerome, educated in it ; more especially the



writings of Cicero, that *Plato togatus*, tended to make them sober-minded ; he was to St. Augustine, the greatest of the Latin fathers, what Shakspeare is to the English divine.

The classical races of Europe owed their physical condition to the children of Japhet, but all their mental energies to those that came as outcasts from Canaan ; there was some good thing in them.

And when Christ came He found more faith in some descendants of those Canaanitish nations than He found in his own people, Israel. The Syro-Phœnician woman, a Canaanite by nation, who said, *the dogs eat of the crumbs that fall from their master's table*, thought more worthily of the impartial mercy of God than they did who looked on one people as absorbing and monopolizing all his care.

Our Lord, in visiting her country, seems to have gone out of his way for the purpose of eliciting faith from Canaanitish lips, and for comforting in her the whole race, which the Israelites of old had so cruelly treated. He reminded her that He had made her race outcasts, dogs, of old, but she claimed that mercy which is over all his works, and the

narrative bids us beware of admitting into our thoughts the leaven of Judaistic perversions, so as to justify slaughter because committed by Israelites, and to forbid crumbs of mercy to the outcast nations.

## XIV.

1. The Gentile Church.—2. A falling away in it analogous to that of the Israelites.—3. Influence of the delusions of the world on the Church.—4. Influence of the temper of the age on translators.

1. IN the preceding Essay the expatriated nations of Canaan were traced to the lands which they colonised, and were recognised as the Gentiles. Seeds from the hand of Him who sowed the good seed fell into every land; but we cannot but see that those which fell on lands in which those banished peoples had not settled either found no depth of ground, as in extreme Asia and tropical Africa; or were trodden under foot by the Buddhist in the far East; or, falling in the land beyond Euphrates, were picked up, and devoured by the Magian sorcerers, unclean birds; or, among the Hindoos, were choked in the moral jungle of sensuality and listlessness. The seed of the word found good ground, took

root, and bore seed, only where the expelled Canaanites, the children of Sidon, Ham's eldest son, spread into the lands where the children of Javan, Japhet's son, had preceded them, which lands thenceforth were known as the isles of the Gentiles.

From Sidon, Tertullian of Carthage came; from Caphtor, the Copt St. Athanasius; and from Javan, Chrysostom of Byzantium.

It was in the language of the descendants of Javan that the Gospel was given to the Gentiles, and it was in the language of the descendants of Sidon, at Carthage, that it was first given to them in the African Latin Vulgate.

St. Peter's mission to the Gentiles was to announce to them that they were capable of being saved, a truth at first hardly credible to the Apostle.

The special mission, to discharge which St. Paul was made an Apostle, was, that he should convey to the Gentiles the good tidings that the Lord dispensed them from passing through the ceremonial law of Levi, and would admit them to the benefits of Christ without it (Eph. iii. 4, 5, 6).

It was a Canaanitish Gentile woman who asked for crumbs from the table of the Lord for her

perishing race. What Christ vouchsafed to her He sent St. Paul to dispense.

The Church of Christ consisted at the beginning of Jews emancipated from Levi, through the waters of baptism, as their forefathers had been emancipated from Pharaoh through the waters of the Red Sea ; and of Gentiles, who had not served Pharaoh, but had served images of wood and stone ; and the waters of baptism were to them like those of the flood to Noah's family, the waters of which floated Noah and his from the kingdom of godless violence to the peaceful Church of the Patriarchs, of whom Noah was the first.

When Christ ascended, He left his Church at the foot of the Mount of Olives, as God, having given the Law, left the Israelites at the foot of Sinai, in these respects, that a wilderness lay before both ; beyond which, to the Israelites lay the land of promise, and to the Christian lies *the rest that remaineth for the people of God* ; and that, to the Israelites, an awful angel, terrible if disobeyed (Exod. xxiii. 21), was given as a guide ; to the Christian, the Holy Ghost, a comforter to guide him into truth ; for wilful sin against whom no remission was provided in the



ordinances of the Church ; as in the Levitical ordinances, no provision was made for wilful breach of any one of the commandments.

Scripture has recorded an outburst of wilfulness, and a preference for idolatry, on the part of the Israelites, at the very foot of Mount Sinai.

The preceding Essays have been conducted on the assumption that these initial lapses had a permanent effect ; the disobedience disabling the Israelites from achieving the position of moral dignity designed for them ; the idolatry incapacitating them from forming a right conception of the intentions of God with reference to their vocation ; and both together effectuating in the people, in priests and laity, a misconception of the revealed record of God's moral government of the world.

The sin of the golden-calf worship, which revived under Jeroboam at Dan and Bethel, was, in the case of the Jewish race, what the sin of Adam was to his posterity ; it deprived the Jews of the enjoyment of Canaan, as Adam's sin deprived his descendants of the happiness of Eden.

It is worse than idle to speculate on the mystery involved in the fact that the Almighty allows his

most benevolent endeavours to be crossed by man's perversity, so that the success of them is delayed. We see that it has been so ; it is the unhappiness in the agency of the creature. A similar unhappiness has manifestly befallen man in the Church of Christ. Christendom has no more abided in the kingdom which Christ designed, than man among the trees which the Lord caused to grow in Eden ; and Christendom has no more made the Church a place of peace, than the Israelites made Canaan a land of rest.

A taint, contracted from one of a former and fallen race of creatures, poisoned man's life in Paradise. A taint from Apis-honouring Egypt vitiated the Israelite. A taint from the infirmity and corruption of the intellect has been the unhappiness of the Church.

We perceive from the manner in which intellect in the Church uses the Old Testament Scriptures as the exponent of God's will and promises, that, when reading the Old Covenant *histories*, she forgets that she is not Jewish, and only when reading the Old Covenant *prophecies*, the spirit in her remembers that she is Christian.

She adopts the Jewish view of the carnal victories

of Joshua and David; she rejects the Jewish view of the inspired utterances of Isaiah and Zachariah.

The intellect of the Church has never questioned the soundness of the Jewish opinions that the intention of the Israelites to slaughter and plunder the Canaanites was also the intention of the Lord. The spirit in her has never hesitated to deny the the soundness of the Jewish opinion that the promise of a Saviour was the promise of a victorious and greater Solomon.

Half of the Old Testament is in *marvellous light*; half is still *untranslated out of darkness*. One half justifies war; the other sanctifies peace, in all versions. The stream of language in which the Old Testament is poured out to the Church is partly bitter water, partly sweet, though attributed to one fountain head.

We are concerned here only with those special unhappinesses in the Church which, when exhibited, prove that there have been causes in operation injurious, if not fatal, to her efforts at evolving from the Old Testament the mystery of God's processes of moral government, as Christianly as the mystery of prophecy has been evolved.

2. It has happened so because, almost from the first, the intellect in the Church was tainted by the corrupt intellect of the world about her.

As in the history of an age of the world, so in that of an age of the Church, some point projects and stands out conspicuous, because there is, in the one, the feature that makes the world what it is ; in the other, that feature which makes the Church what it is.

This salient point in the Church always has been, and always must be, the mind and practice of the Church, in that age, in the ministering of *the one only public rite of divine service* which the Lord of the Church appointed, *the Holy Eucharist*, that is to say, *Thanksgiving for Christ our Passover sacrificed for us*.

We see, in its celebration minutely portrayed by Justin Martyr (circ. A.D. 140), the mind and manipulation of the immediate representatives of the Apostles ; and recognise it at once as the rite instituted by Christ, and described by St. Paul ; even a deaf communicant could have recognised there *the breaking of the loaf* ; even the blind could have known that *the cup of blessing* was being blessed.

In the Church celebration, even in the age suc-

ceeding that in which the Fathers at Nicæa protested that the primitive customs ought to prevail, we find much in this most solemn service of the Church so different from that service as set forth by the Apostle, that we suspect the Council to have had in view the ancient order of precedence among prelates, rather than the primitive ritual, when it decreed τὰ ἄρχαία ἔθῃ κρατεῖτω.

We do not proceed far into the centuries of the Church before we find her ministers and services spoken of in terms which savour quite as much of the Hierophant and Adytum of mystic rites as they do of the Apostle and the *large upper room*.

3. The early Church breathed in an atmosphere which was of the very exhalations of sorcery, her daily speech was full of its jargon, and probably the people first applied terms, borrowed from mysteries with which they were familiar, to the ministers and ceremonies of the Gospel, with which they were imperfectly acquainted. And so it may have happened that a title such as *mystagogue* may first have been given by the populace to the Church teacher; and the titles *μεμνήμενοι* and *μύσται*, initiated, to those whom the Apostles called the



baptized and communicants, *κοινωνοί*. So the epithet mystagogic may have been applied by some editor to Cyril's Catechetical Lectures, not by himself; for many treatises in those days, as now, were published by hearers who took notes. Such and similar unapostolic terms may thus have crept in unawares into the phraseology of the Church, and may have been gradually adopted by her without consideration of the fact that words always import, into sciences and theories by which they are adopted, more or less of the idea first attaching to them: as in English, *priest* never sounds *presbyter* written short, but always *Pontifex* written large.

However this may have been, the prelate, ὁ προεστὼς, of Justin Martyr's times, soon appears as a sacrificing priest, ὁ ἱερεύς, sometimes ἱεράρχης, in the Constt. Apost. ἀρχιερεύς, High Priest; the teaching pastor a mystagogue,\* μυστηρίων λανθάνοντων μυσταγωγὸς (Greg. Nys. de Christi. Bapt.); the Eucharist, the great thanksgiving,

\* Mystagogue, literally, the guide of the initiated; but Tully tells us that the Syracusans called cicerones mystagogues, *hi qui hospites ad ea quæ visenda sunt ducere solent* (in Verr. iv.); as sacristans show churches.

becomes the Mysteries ; the creed is taught as a secret ; and the words of blessing (consecration) are inaudibly whispered ; the words *μύησις* or *μύημα*, initiation, are applied to baptism by the writer of the Apostolic canons—to initiation into secret heathen fellowship by Iamblichus, writing in the same age.

Almost all of these terms soon died out in the Church ; they and the ancient mysteries faded away together. They were never primitive and apostolical ; the title priest, *ιερεύς*, is by the Apostle reserved in sense and title, to Christ, under whom clergy and laity make up the *holy and royal priesthood* whom St. Peter addresses, among whom were *elders* (i. Pet. iv. 1). The Apostolic orders appear to have been bishops, elders, and deacons.

Mystery is never used by the Apostles to designate the Eucharist ; a *great mystery*, such as that involved in marriage, means *an important spiritual meaning*, a hidden meaning within an obvious one.

Sacrifice they apply metaphorically to any service except the Eucharist (though it is pre-eminently applicable to it) ; probably, *being warned of God* not

to furnish a handle for misconceiving minds to lay hold of; or because they reserved the word for the substance; knowing, indeed, of shadows of sacrifice, but knowing of one only true and real sacrifice, the one offered at Calvary.

As we can account for the true doctrine and sound forms in the Church only by attributing them to the Apostles and their successors, so we can account for some delusions in the practices of the Church only by tracing them to that power in the world which strove for the mastery with the Apostles, and that power was sorcery and its mysteries, which ever strove to inaugurate fellowship between Christ and Belial (2 Cor. vi. 15), as Simon did at Samaria.

It was not the classical worship of graven images, nor yet the intellectual worship of wisdom (*the Greeks seek after wisdom*; 1 Cor. i. 23) that energetically opposed the Gospel at first; but sorcery, in the person of Elymas at Cyprus, and of those who succumbed and burnt their books and renounced their curious arts at Ephesus.

The classical lands, wearied of carved images, had turned the little mental energy which they still retained towards the philosophers, the subtle mani-

pulators of words and arguments; and the listless and sensual population of the East was replenished more than ever with soothsayers from beyond the Euphrates, many of them, like the *sons of one Sceva a Jew*, apostates, descendants of the Jewish wizards of the captivity who took root in Babylon, and did not join in the return from the captivity.

Through such it happened that the Gentiles who first heard the Gospel, heard it with ears already preoccupied by the enchantments of the mystic and demonologist.

This state of the intellect made St. Paul tremble lest the Church should be spoilt *by philosophy and vain deceit* (Col. ii. 8), terms by which, as the context shows us, he meant sorcery; by *the worshipping of angels* foretelling the *Æons* of the Valentinians and of the Gnostics.\*

It must have been from familiarity with curious arts, and pretensions to an anti-natural power, which

\* We find that the Septuagint translate *iddonim*, γινῶσται (1 Sam. xxviii. 3); the word means *knowing ones, wise men, wizards* (*wise hearts?*); the Vulgate translates it *magi*. It is possible that the Church gave the name *Gnostics* in the sense of *wizards* or *sorcerers* to the heretics, so called from the word γινῶσται in Sept.

made man receive, without questioning them, anecdotes such as that related by St. Cyprian, of the consecrated bread turning into a cinder in the hands of the unworthy communicant (De Lapsis, xvi.), "tangible grace turned into material ashes." Minds that could consider such an occurrence consistent with the operation of grace, must have received a deflecting impulse, so that their thoughts did not run parallel with those of the Apostles. And it is to the abiding traces of this deflection that we must attribute the notion, still ruling the mature mind of Christendom in places, that the consecrating priest is endued with the power of transmuting substances.

But the Church never wavered in her detestation of sorcery. Tertullian declares that the Church assaulted, rather than parleyed with, the magian; *Magiam nec invitatoriâ operatione sed expugnatoriâ dominatione tractamus*; he designates it the proteus-like plague of the human mind, *multiformem luementis humanæ* (De Animâ, lvii.). It was too wildly feared to be wisely hated. The heart of the Church was always true to her Lord; no word in her Creed ever echoed back any sound but that of the Gospel.



We can no further condemn the Church of those ages because a secular infection tainted somewhat her spiritual health, than we can condemn a church because a national spirit of barter makes the care of souls a matter for traffic in her days. But this we may assert, that the particular unhappiness of the Church in the days of mystic theology was, that she wasted her intellect in endeavouring to clothe her idle fancies with the Gospel ordinances, rather than in exercising them in carrying the lamp of the Gospel into the recesses of the Old Testament, and in discovering the mystery of God's moral government by demonstrating the identity, not in power but in gentleness, of the Lord of the Gospel, who is not willing that any should perish, with the Lord who sent the Israelites into Canaan.

As Tertullian powerfully urges that it is not credible that so many and such great Churches should have erred concerning a faith held by all in common, it might be similarly argued that an interpretation and view of the Old Testament records adopted in common by all Churches cannot but be the only true. It is therefore necessary, since it is doubted, to adduce reasons for believing that the Church

never found leisure, nor attained to learning, adequate to the task of interpreting the Hebrew Scriptures for herself. It may be said that, satisfied with such as she had, she never invoked and utilised the promised Spirit for the task.

Our Lord indeed, and his Apostles, had inspected the tracts of the Old Testament records, and had brought away and shown to the Church some gleanings of the precious fruits to be gathered by those who would search the Scriptures in his Spirit and method; such as the principles of the nature of God, *He is kind to the unthankful and to the evil*, and of his moral law, *I say unto you, love your enemies*, samples of a hidden wisdom to be found there by those who seek; but the Church has left those tracts in the hands of the Anakim, the Rabbin, who are lords of interpretation to us through St. Jerome, their scholar; and thus it is that the Gospel truth lies still in the Old Dispensation, hidden under the accumulated detritus of ages of unspiritual commentaries.

4. "There seems to have been no Catholic exposition of Scripture, no traditionary comment on its continuous text" (J. H. Newman, in Preface to

St. Cyril's Cat. Lec., Library of the Fathers). There have been intellectual commentators, as Origen ; industrious interpreters, as St. Jerome ; but the temper of the age in which they lived, and voices and impressions from the sounds and sights in the times when they were labouring, permeated into their retreats, and make themselves perceptible in the tone of their comments, and in the diction of their translations.

Origen recoiled from the notion of reading the Jewish wars to the disciples of the Prince of Peace.\* His heart was the heart of the Church while yet tender ; he had not heard of wars between Christian states. The doings of the barbaric hordes had not familiarised him with destruction ; he knew only of a Church that had suffered, and had not persecuted ; not of the bitterness of persecuting zeal and strife of heretics. Arius was yet in his cradle, and Alaric unborn, when Origen wrote. Origen, therefore, would have the Christian warned that the only

\* Nisi bella ista carnalia figuram bellorum spiritualium gererent nunquàm, opinor, Judaicarum historiarum libri discipulis Christi, qui venit pacem docere, legendi in Ecclesiis fuissent ab Apostolis traditi."—ORIGEN, *Homil. in Joshuam*.

lawful war was against spiritual evil. Origen could not have preached a crusade.

St. Jerome breathed a different atmosphere, a different world was about him. He turned sometimes from the text which he was translating, or on which he was commenting, to open letters from home announcing this or that town sacked by the barbarians, or Alaric in Rome itself. When he heard of Rome taken by the Goths he was handling Ezekiel, and said out of Isaiah, *Nocte Moab capta est*. "When I would begin to dictate," he writes, "my mind is so confused by the devastation of the Western Provinces, and especially of the city of Rome, that, as they say, I can hardly remember my own name" (*proprium vocabulum*).—Ad. Marcell, Ep. 82.

He thought it but natural that Joshua should be commanded to do to the Canaanites as he wished should be done to the Gothic hordes, and goes beyond all translators in bitterness. He would have Joshua commanded not to anathematize them, but to slay them with indiscriminate slaughter, *percuties eos usque ad internecionem*. And though St. Jerome, full of admiration of Origen's labours and skill in

the Scriptures, styled him Adamantius, the same Origin was *Amalek* to him when he advocated the opinion that God's punishments were intended to be corrective, not destructive. The difference in the two men's temperaments is the difference in the temperaments of the ages in which they respectively lived, and their commentaries imbibed that temperament.

To remove a discrepancy between two genealogies in Scripture, whilst at the same time we do not eliminate the discrepancy between the human bias of the translator and the spirit of the original, is to strain out a gnat and swallow a camel.

It was not to be expected that the correction of the Vulgate by the popes Sixtus V. and Clement VIII. would eliminate any traces of the spirit of the former translator's age from the text; the authorised index to that version directs the reader to texts proving that the Lord commanded images to be made and used (the instance being the brazen serpent), but tacitly professes ignorance of any text where the Lord forbids the use of images.



By the Vulgate Latin and the authorised English versions the intellects of the past ages of European Christianity have been nurtured. Each has been of inestimable use and value ; if either has been perverted to an unworthy use, the fault has been in the minds that abused good things.

Tyndale's version was written, as it were, by the light of the fires that burnt in Smithfield, as they burnt, fed by the bodies of Christians, in the circus of Pagan Rome. Even when the authorised version appeared, punishment and cruelty were synonymous. No apprehension was felt lest the people, having the Scriptures in their vernacular tongue, should learn cruelty from reading that, according to translators, the Lord at Jericho and Aï had sanctified cruelty to the use of his people, though some good men were concerned, lest the people should discover that the Scriptures did not sanction some dogmas of the current theology. But none apprehended that it would be so speedily abused as it was when the Long Parliament extracted from the version, and published separately for distribution among the people, the record of the wars of Israel and Judah, in order to establish a Scriptural doc-

trine of civil war in the Great Rebellion.\* Nor did any suspect that men conversant with all versions of Scripture, the Nonjurors at the Revolution, would have justified their adherence to James by texts taken exclusively from the Old Testament, as long as they refused allegiance to his successor; but would have justified their submission to that successor when they turned and submitted (as Secker among some others did), by quotations taken exclusively from the New Testament Scriptures.

It is from such contradictions in the conduct of men, whether Puritans zealous for the Gospel of peace, but taking advantage of the Old Testament to foment war by it; or Nonjurors, zealous for lawful authority, disproving one day out of the New Testament the duties which they defended the day before by the help of the Old Testament; that we

\* Professor Kingsley, in "The Teuton and the Roman," states that Ulphilas omitted the books of the Old Testament which record the wars of the people from his translation of the Septuagint into Gothic. But since Jahn first stated this the missing books of the Gothic version have been found on a palimpsest MS. at Milan. Professor Kingsley also suggests that the word God is really Goth, a warrior; if this is so, the fact itself is a strong reproof of those whose views of Scripture originated or promoted that notion of the character of the Almighty.

are irresistibly led to conclude that there must be some special defect in the conceptions of all translators, which has prevented them from giving to the whole inspired Scripture the expression of one and the same spirit.

It is because the mists of passion or of prejudice intercept the reflection, by the mirror held up before the original, of the nature and intentions of the Lord, as they are on that original.

## XV.

1. Relative places occupied by the ceremonial law, and by the Temple services in the Jewish life.—2. The usual conception of the Temple sacrifices is confused and exaggerated.—3. Elementary principles of worship by sacrifice.—4. Holocaust.

1. ST. PAUL reckoned the privilege of the Jew to have been that, to the Jews *were committed* (entrusted), not the law and ordinances of sacrifice, but *the oracles of God*. By the expression λόγια τοῦ Θεοῦ, which St. Peter also uses, the Apostle could hardly have meant the whole O. T. Scriptures, but rather the very utterances of God, the Commandments and the Proclamation of His Name.\*

\* St. Stephen (Acts vii.) describes that law which Moses received before the golden calf was made, and therefore before the Levitical ordinances were enacted, as λόγια ζῶντα, *lively oracles*. The Septuagint ought to have translated *dabir* (1 Kings vi. 16), by λόγιον, but they left the Hebrew word untranslated; it there means the ark, so called because it contained the *ten words* of God. So Philo writes, ἡ μὲν κιβωτὸς ἀγγελίων τῶν νόμων ἐστίν, εἰς γὰρ ταύτην κατα-

But to a tribe, that of Levi, the conduct of the public services of religion was committed, the functions of which became more and more complicated as the House of Prayer grew from the original tent of curtains to the elaborate Temple.

Whilst the whole twelve tribes remained faithful to the throne of David many lived so far from Jerusalem that they could visit the Temple only three times a year at most.

But when the ten tribes revolted, about thirty years after the establishment of the Temple ritual, the faithful gradually migrated from the revolted provinces into Judah (2 Chron. xv. 9, &c.) ; so that the Temple services were within reach of all who desired them. But they had never before been frequented by the bulk of the people, though the Temple was the parish church of the whole country.

*τίθεισαν τὰ χρησθέντα λόγια, the ark is called the vessel of the laws, for in it were deposited the oracles uttered. (De vitâ Mosis, l. 3, quoted by Biel.)* The Septuagint apply *λόγιον* to the breastplate of Urim and Thummim, supposing that they gave oracular responses. Josephus follows them, writing *ἑσσην* for the Hebrew *chosheen*, and explaining the word to mean *an oracle* ; hence our popular notion of the oracular virtue of the Urim and Thummim, In the book Ecclesiasticus (xlv. 11) they are also called *λόγια κρίσεως, the oracles of judgment.*



The impression left by a comprehensive view of the matter is that it fared with the Temple and its services much as it has fared with the parish churches in England. Long intervals of dilapidation, careless ministrations, and perfunctory services to indifferent congregations, were succeeded by spasmodic efforts for the restoration of a better state of things, in which efforts some were earnest, but the multitude only unstable revivalists at best.

But he who would judge of the Temple services should aim at obtaining a clear notion of what they were intended to be ; how the Jew, within reach of the priest and altar, availed himself of his advantages ; and what it was which the Jew, so situated, considered the most useful office of the priest, for which he had most constant recourse to him : under no other conditions can the Old Testament be truly apprehended,

The Passover may be left out of consideration, because it was peculiar as a national festival ; and came to be called *Petscho*, the Festival ; losing the name that gave it its intended significance, it came to be viewed as the great annual gathering, social and commercial, at Jerusalem (there were buyers

and sellers then in the Temple courts), resort to which was a pilgrimage.

The spiritual status of the Jew rested and was built up on two ordinances, and no more. By circumcision he was identified with Abraham;\* at the yearly Passover he acknowledged the origin of his nationality. The Ten Commandments occupied with the Jew the position which the Creed has in the Christian mind; and the religion of which he was conscious was comprised in the expectation of a Redeemer, and in his own conceptions concerning Him.

His daily walk of life, however, was ruled by ceremonial precepts, the principles and theory of which were in the law, but the deductions and details of practice, matter of tradition; there was no action so minute as not to be matter for cleanness or uncleanness in the manner of doing it; no occurrence so trivial as not to suggest reference to the priest as to its bearing on a man's state in the eye of the ceremonial law, which had its directors of the

\* Circumcision, though sometimes put to mean the whole Jewish religion, yet did not bind men to keep the Levitical ordinances; if it did so, St. Paul would not have circumcised Timothy.

conscience and its confessional and casuists more subtle and inventive than in any other ecclesiastical system.

It became, in process of time, an unbearable yoke, as St. Peter described it. To the Galatians, half inclined to adopt its rites and ceremonial, St. Paul exclaimed, *O foolish Galatians . . . stand fast in the liberty wherewith Christ hath made you free.* The first Council of the Church, making it a thing of nought, was hailed by Jewish and Gentile converts as a consolation from the Comforter.

The whole life of the Jew, as we know him from the prophets and from the New Testament, was governed by the minutiae of ceremonial matters; on the observance of them he depended for his superiority over the *sinner of the Gentiles*, as he termed all non-ceremonial nations. He read all Scripture with the eye of the casuist in such matters. He considered the object of his religion to consist in enabling him to be perfect in all matters of ceremonial cleanness.

The question raised as to our Lord's washing before meat opened whole volumes of cases decided concerning it. St. Paul's opinion about eating things

that had been offered to idols touched a matter of profound and abstruse difficulty to the Jew. The Apostle, evidently, contemplated the well-known case of a thing unlawful to eat, which, nevertheless, did not pollute the eater of it.

The office of the priest was engrossed by such cases; the discharge of that function Maimonides calls the *Abodah Zarah*, or service of separation, of clean from unclean.

If a man found an insect in the bread at his meals it was a nice point to say whether it had polluted all the other food.\*

He would go to inquire of the Lord on the subject, to hear the *word of God*; the priest who solved the question prefaced his decision with the formula *thus saith the Lord*; the man would report that *the Lord said unto him*, what the priest said,

\* The priest appealed to to decide whether the clothes of the bearer, if sanctified by the touch of the flesh of the sacrifice, could transmit that sanctification to what they touched (Hag. ii. 12), would have answered, No; from the case decided which ruled that the sacrifice was the first father of sanctification, the garment only its posterity. And so with things that polluted. The thing that polluted was the Adam of uncleanness; the thing polluted by it, the posterity of the first father.

and the priest's answer he would call *the word of the Lord*.

Hence we may see how grossly we may err if we suppose the Lord to have spoken whenever it is recorded *the Lord said*. The Jew knew how much it meant.

Such was the multitude, led by blind guides who condemned the accidents, but overlooked the principle, of an evil deed, *strained out the gnat but swallowed the camel*.

And yet, lest we should think that such misconceptions of religion were necessarily general, the opening chapters of St. Matthew and St. Luke show us the devout priest Zacharias, the conscientious man Joseph, a congregation at the daily sacrifice, and souls waiting for the consolation of Israel; and altogether we may perceive that the Temple, fresh from its restoration by Herod, was, at that time, fully furnished with worshippers, and served by a priesthood, and furnished with teachers, narrow-minded, it may be, but diligent and zealous.

2. When a clear conception of the Temple, its services and its rites, is mentally formed from the description and injunctions in Leviticus and Exodus,



and from the details given by Moses of the pattern he had seen, and of the instructions he had received on the Mount; and when this conception is embodied in the fabric raised by Solomon, the result is *the beauty of holiness*; the perfection of beauty, harmony, and decency produced by the combination of all that gratifies the eye, and ear, and every sense.

The scene of money changing and of buying and selling, which our Lord witnessed in its courts, and that of Judas Iscariot casting down the wages of treachery on its marble floor before the callous and scoffing priests, sadly mar the vision of the Temple in its true glory.

Similarly do the ignorant accounts given by the Rabbin of the circumstances of sacrifice, blood in pailfuls passed from hand to hand, and dashed upon the altar (Sepher Middoth), disturb the conception of the Temple rites, revolt the senses, and carry their own refutation on the record.

If such details are accepted they introduce the element of physical impossibility of performance among other elements of controversy; and therefore some clear conception of the sacrifices of the Temple should be carefully sought.

The Talmudists, who never witnessed the Temple service, have left us, in the book Middoth, such notions of the accessories of sacrifice in the Temple, that if we believe them its courts were slaughter-houses.\*

Many of their statements, however, are so repugnant to the methods of the rites, as first instituted, that we have no hesitation in refusing to give their accounts even the limited credit which they claim; for their statements on points are given as hearsay, often from reporters who contradict one another; and on some points it is confessed that no one knew, or no one remembered, the actual state of things in the Temple.

\* Most probably in the patriarchal sacrifices, of only one animal at a time, the whole blood, the organ of animal life, was poured out at the base of the altar, as was done at the sacrifice of the red heifer (Lev. iv. 7); and at the sacrifice at the consecration of the family of Aaron (Lev. viii.); and the souls of the martyrs who had offered their lives as pledges of the truth of the Gospel, were seen by the Apostle in the vision poured out, as it were, at the base of the altar, for this is the meaning of *ὑποκάτω τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου*, not *under*, as it were *beneath* it.

In theory and in practice the quantity of blood applied to the altar, affected the validity of the sacrifice no more than does the quantity of water applied to a person at his baptism affect the validity of the sacrament.

The bias of the Rabbinical mind towards the marvellous and incredible is illustrated by the statement that when incense was burnt in the Temple, it overpowered the nostrils of the flocks that were feeding many miles off; their tradition, however, that the great Hallelujahs in the Temple were audible at Jericho is one which it pleases our minds to believe; and it is certain that the lighted lamps of the Temple were seen very far through the transparent atmosphere of Judæa.

The lighting of the lamps in the Temple at six o'clock on the sixth day of the Jewish week was the signal that the Sabbath had commenced; and at their first gleam, men in the fields around dropped their tools, and ceased work; and in the town the household observance of the Sabbath instantly began.

The Evangelists have recorded that, as the hurried burial of the Lord Jesus Christ was just concluded, τὸ σάββατον ἐπέφωσκε, *the Sabbath lamps flashed out in the Temple*, and they who had assisted at our Lord's entombment suspended their pious labours, and *rested the Sabbath day, according to the commandment* (Luke xxiii. 54, 56).

3. In endeavouring to master the theory and practice of worship by sacrifice, whether an offering compelling self-denial in the worshipper, or a sacrifice in its popular and vague acceptances, as a victim slain, the first elementary but pervading principle, to be discerned and never lost sight of, is, that the Lord claimed and required everything that had life, or sustained life, to be offered to Him.

But of families, the first-born son ; of corn-fields, the first ripe sheaf ; of olive-yards, the first oil expressed ; of vineyards, the first wine trodden out ; of beasts slain for sacrifices, the first drops of the blood shed ; were offered and accepted as adequate offerings of the whole aggregate, whether family, wheat-crop, oil, wine, or life. Christ offered Himself, and was accepted, for the whole aggregate human race ; He is called the firstfruits.

The principle is laid down explicitly (Num. xviii. 27) in the matter of tithe received by the Levites in kind, *This your heave-offering shall be reckoned unto you, as though it were the corn of the thrashing-floor, and as the fulness of the winepress.*

The principle of the Law was, that nothing should be eaten unless part of it had first been

offered to the Lord; and, still more strictly, that no animal food should be eaten unless the animal had been sacrificed, its life given back to the Lord who gave it. *The blood is the life*, is the rule of the law; and, accordingly, some few drops of the animal's blood were sprinkled from a bunch of hyssop, or some other appliance, on the altar. One drop of blood was as the whole life.

There being but one altar in the land, the physical impossibility of offering at it all animals slain for food was provided for by the sacrifice and offering of a lamb daily in the Temple; which offering sanctified all the animal food eaten everywhere that day in the land. The animals required for the supply being eaten, as the roebuck and the hart were commonly eaten, in the wilderness, without having been individually offered at the altar. So men die, in multitudes, everywhere and continually, but one Lord died for all, and his death was as the death of all, and his offering of Himself as that of the one hundred and forty-four thousands of Israel, and the multitude that no man can number of all nations (Rev. vii. 9).

Similarly the daily offering of flour, wine and



oil sanctified all of these that were consumed in the land that day.

The daily labour of the whole population was sanctified by the daily labour of the Levites offered to the Lord in the Temple in the discharge of their duties. The consecration of the root sanctified the branches.

It is consistent with this principle, apparently of universal application to all things used, to conclude, that when Solomon, at the dedication, offered many thousand oxen and many thousand sheep, the sacrifice of one animal of each kind in the Temple gave the title of sacrifices to the whole number offered on any one day; and that all the others were slain in suitable places, not in the Temple, though in Jerusalem.\*

4. The popular notion of *holocausts*, victims wholly burnt, has been extended to the Temple sacrifices, partly owing to the misconception of words.

\* It is possible that, on strict principle, only Levites could lawfully slay for food; at least a *clean* Israelite and a *clean* knife were required; by *clean*, we understand licensed and certified by the priests. All flesh meat was called *sacrifices* by the Jews; a mere dry mouthful of food is contrasted with sacrifices, flesh meat (Prov. xvii. 1).

Such sacrifices as those offered by Samuel (i. 7, 9), and by Elijah at Mount Carmel, when the whole victim was burnt, were patriarchal, not Levitical nor Temple sacrifices.

The burnt offerings at the consecration of Aaron (Lev. viii.) were also peculiar; the victims were sacrificed, and offered; and wholly burnt, not near, nor in the Tabernacle, but beyond the limits of the camping-ground.

In the usual Temple sacrifices all that was burnt was some portion of the fat (which in animals of that climate is in proverbially small quantity) mixed with incense, this was caused to ascend by being vaporized by the action of fire, as the Hebrew expresses the rite; this was the whole that was burnt.

The Hebrew word, *holoh*, to cause to ascend, being followed by *fire* or *burning*, where burnt offerings are mentioned, and being difficult to express concisely in Greek, the Septuagint seem to have transferred it untranslated, but in Greek letters, into their text, combining it with *καύτωμα* or *καύτωσις*; and so we read *όλοκαύτωμα*, which the Vulgate translates by *holocaustum*, and which

Hesychius explains by, ὅλον πυρὶ καθαγιαζόμενον, *wholly sanctified by fire*.

The Septuagint very commonly transferred Hebrew words, especially technical terms, untranslated; and as they knew that the Hebrew calls a whole burnt offering, *kalil*, they could not have intended a whole burnt offering by ὁλοκαύτωμα: for they knew the meaning of *holoh*, a very common word; so that either they have left it untransferred, which is not likely, or have transferred its letters, hence ὅλο in *holocaust* is not the Greek ὅλον, *whole*, but<sup>1</sup> the Hebrew *holoh*, *sent up*. It is, however, evident from the Hebrew text that what the Septuagint and Vulgate call a *holocaust* was simply the burning, not of the victim, but of incense with fat, both in small quantities.

This fat and the incense were the whole sacrifice, so far as its offering to the Lord was concerned: the flesh, if it was a peace-offering, was taken away, either to be sold or used for food by the worshipper (Prov. vii. 14); if a sin-offering, it was partly eaten by the priests; if to be wholly burnt, it was removed beyond the consecrated area of the Temple, to be burnt (Ezek. xliii. 21). *The bodies of*

*those beasts, whose blood is brought into the sanctuary for sin, are burnt without the camp (Heb. xiii. 11).*

Though at periods the Temple ritual may have been very grossly performed, and its courts and services made offensive to the senses, yet if we carefully consider the original enactments, and the vision of the reformed Temple and ritual in the Book of Ezekiel, we cannot fail to conclude that the original ritual carefully removed all that was offensive, and secured material cleanness and sweetness.

## XVI.

1. The Temple and the Church.—2. The sacrifice which Christ made.—3. His offering of it.

IN reading Leviticus we can easily distinguish between precepts necessitated by a movable Tabernacle and a nomadic life, and those which contemplated a place where God should *cause his name to dwell*, and a people living within their gates in houses of towns.

The precept concerning sacrifices, *i.e.*, animals killed for food, *in the open field* (Lev. xvii. 5), is merely wilderness legislation. Our concern is only with the Temple as designed by David.

What is conventionally called the Temple, must critically be divided into three distinct parts ; first, the whole consecrated area, *ιερόν* (our Lord *taught daily* in the Temple, *ιερόν*) ; secondly, the sanctuary, the first veiled Tabernacle, *ιαός* (*the veil of the*



*Temple, ναός, was rent in twain*) ; thirdly, the holiest place, ἄγιον, the second veiled Tabernacle, the holiest of all.

This holiest place is the *Shekinah*, the dwelling-place of God on earth, who dwelt on earth in a Tabernacle, not in a city which hath foundations. The Earthly Jerusalem being a Tent, the Heavenly, a City.\*

The worshipper entering the sacred precincts (τέμενος, ἱερόν), to offer a sacrifice, found before him, first, the altar of stone on which the blood of the animal-victim was sprinkled ; and beyond it a veil (the first veil), within which, out of his sight, was the brazen altar of incense, θυσιαστήριον ; into which even Solomon, at the dedication, did not enter : *The king stood before the altar, in the midst of the court* (2 Chron. vi. 12). *King Joash stood by a pillar, as the manner was* (2 Kings xi. 14).

The priest took the fat (memorial) of the sacri-

\* The word *Shekinah* is not biblical Hebrew, but Aramaic, it means the *act of dwelling* on the part of the Lord in the Tabernacle ; it does not imply any visible appearance such as brightness. St. John seems to have had the word and the idea in his mind when he wrote ὁ λόγος ἐσκήνωσεν ἐν ἡμῖν, *the word dwelt among us*, in the flesh.

fice, type of the man's good deed, and put incense on it, type of the merits of Christ, and nitre (*every sacrifice shall be salted with salt*), type of the man's sins which caused the wrath of God to kindle against him, passed through the veil out of the worshipper's sight, and offered them on the brazen altar of incense within the first (σκηνή) tabernacle, on which fire was ever burning.

This was the ἀνάμνησις ἁμαρτιῶν (Heb. x. 3), the man's mindful acknowledgment of sin; it was not an atoning sacrifice, but an act of contrition for sin.

Having thus offered, the man worshipped; prostrating himself; with still two veils between him and the place of the presence of God.

He could not even see the veil of the holiest place, for *the way to\* the holiest of all was not yet made manifest, whilst as the first tabernacle was yet standing* (Heb. ix. 8), ἐχούση στάσιν.

The first, *i.e.* ante-tabernacle (of which the Apostle speaks, Heb. ix.), does not mean, as the

\* The E. V. has spoilt this text by translating τὴν τῶν ἁγίων ὁδόν, *the way into the holiest*: surely it is *the way leading to the holiest place*: as τὴν ὁδὸν τοῦ ξύλου τῆς ζωῆς, *the way of the tree of life, i.e., the way to it*. I do not know whether recent critics have noticed this.

*Tabernacle in the wilderness* does, a temple or church first in order of time, that is to say anterior to the Christian Church ; but a tabernacle first reached in approaching the place of the presence of God, where He dwelt between the Cherubim, in the second tabernacle, the holiest place.

The Apostle's aim is to show that Christians have been admitted, by Christ's rending the veil for them, into a place nearer to God than the Jews were allowed to occupy ; whereas, before, the people were not allowed even to see the golden candlestick, the table of shew bread, or the altar of incense ; so that priests and people, in Christ, are *a royal priesthood*, admitted to be where, before, the priests only could stand ; and to see the golden candlestick, the Gospel light ; and to eat the spiritual bread of God's table ; which before was not spiritual and which the priests only might eat, they being the servants of the household ; true believers being all *of the household of Christ*, and fed at his table. For now, Christ, the Master of the House, admits us to his table. And also we draw near, priests and people, to his altar of incense ; for, *ἔχομεν θυσιαστήριον*, *we have an altar*.

It must be owned that the English liturgy and ritual is not as distinct as is desirable, but gives a weak if not an uncertain sound concerning the requisite oblation which our having an altar presupposes.

Partly hence, perhaps, and partly because they have not sufficiently considered that we have wherewith to offer, *e.g.* our *bodies as living sacrifices*; our alms, as *offering of a sweet savour unto God*; and operations of the immaterial man also, praises and thanksgivings; and the painful self-denial of lusts most dear, and desirable to make us wise and happy in sin: for such are the sacrifices and offerings which we have the privilege and opportunity of making; deluded also by an ill-informed notion that sacrifices are of things material; some have thought that the Christian priest might offer what our only High Priest can offer; and not considering Uzzah's fatal mistake in thinking that the Ark could not stand without the help and intervention of man, have reckoned that the perpetuity of the CONTINUAL OFFERING was a matter in which creatures of *no abiding city* can minister.

When we would say that the priest offers Christ

at the Eucharist, (since the Eucharist was, undoubtedly, from the first, celebrated in the sight of the people), we must, to be consistent, admit that it is inconsistent with the ordinance of *offering* sacrifice, that it should be offered in the sight of man.

The sacrifice was slain before the people, so Christ suffered in the sight of men; but every act of offering a sacrifice was withdrawn from the sight of the people. The father of John the Baptist was within the veil, out of the people's sight, whilst he was burning the incensed memorial of the daily lamb. He was within the first veil.

The high priest went out of sight even of the priests when he entered within the second veil to offer on the great day of Atonement.

Christ suffered in the sight of men; but He withdrew into heaven for the purpose of offering Himself to God for us.

If an analogy is admitted, and much more if it is pressed, the conclusion must be that though priests can offer certain sacrifices, such as those of praise and thanksgiving, in the tabernacle (the church) into which Christ made a way for them to enter through the veil, that is his flesh, his human nature,



so that they are admitted to the *θυσιαστήριον*, the altar of incense ; no one but a high priest, and we own no high priest but Christ, can offer Christ ; for, to do so, he must enter within the second veil, still standing, and pass into heaven itself.

For at the sacrifice of Atonement, on the great Day of Atonement, once a year, the people being *spectators* outside the veil (their usual place) ; and the high priest being within the first veil, the priests, having sacrificed, offered the memorial, fat, incense, nitre, as usual on the brazen altar ; giving to the high priest some of the blood of the sacrifice which they had offered, and the high priest alone entered with it, within the second veil, into the holiest place (*ἅγιον*), with the golden censer of incense, and sprinkled the drops on the base of the Mercy Seat, and wafted incense over it. In so doing he was a shadow of Christ leaving his people on earth, his priests on the Mount of Olives, and Himself, alone, entering with his atoning sacrifice within the veil of the heavens and offering it, with the sweet savour of his merits, at the Throne of Mercy ; this was the *μνημόσυνον*, memorial presented. The high priest

entered and departed, for such sacrifices needed repeating; but Christ having entered, and having been accepted, was bidden, *Sit thou on my right hand,* and sat down.

His sitting down intimated that He needed not to officiate again, for no more offering of sacrifice was required.

The sacrifice of Christ was the sacrifice of his life; blood and life were made synonymous from the beginning; his blood shed was but a symbol of his life, refused to worldliness, but spent on God.

His sacrifice was his life, which he refused to the world, the flesh, and the devil, and gave to God from those his early years when first He lived *in favour with God*; throughout his youth, during which he made no mark to leave among men; to his manhood, which He consecrated to the work which He came to do; up to his death, when He laid down his life, *of Himself, that He might suffer death for all men.*

It is difficult to form any estimate of the sacrifice which Christ made by renouncing the life of the intellect and abilities which He had.

Since He was tempted in all things as we are, He must have been tempted by those ambitions, which

are greatest the nobler the mind is, to excel in knowledge, and in controlling men, and to win fame.

He, the Son of the human race, inherited and anticipated all the intellect and powers that have been in man, and had, by anticipation as it were, all since developed, and that can be developed in the compass of perfect man.

In Him the fulness of the Godhead dwelt in the fulness of manhood.

We cannot estimate what He renounced, as man, when He rejected the offer of the kingdoms of the world and all the glory of them. He might have left a name great on earth, above every name, for science, war, or wealth.

He might have brought and shown to men the secrets and the marvels of science and of nature from the depths of that ocean, to the shores of which, and to pick up its fragmentary shells, Newton was obliged, from paucity of intellect, to confine himself. He might have made a universal empire.

But among the things despised which He preferred, was a despised lot in life; and He valued the hue of the lily of the field above the robes of

Solomon, and to be a servant above being a king, and to teach humility above teaching knowledge that puffeth up.

Possibly, in a higher state of existence, we may know somewhat of the temptations and inclinations which Christ overcame, and of the aspirations which He quenched, in making his life a sacrifice.

The culminating sacrifice of that life was to be content to lay it down, when just entered on those years when life begins to ripen in its faculties and powers.

But for these sufferings of sacrifice we might doubt the human nature of Christ; for He is greater than man in self-denial; and equal to God in all that God ever proclaimed Himself to be, and in all that God has ever been recorded, or has recorded Himself to have done. *Βλέπῳ τὰ θαύματα καὶ ἀνακηρύσσω τὴν θεότητα· ὁρῶ τὰ πάθη καὶ οὐκ ἀρνόυμαι τὴν ἀνθρωπότητα.* (Proclus Hom. in Incarn.) “I behold his miracles, and I proclaim his Godhead, I see his sufferings, and I do not deny his humanity.”

*Note on the Shew Bread.*

It would be interesting to know whether “shew bread” was a term of feudal times applied to the *white* loaf of the feudal lord’s table on the dais; of which only the lord and his intimates partook, not the servants at the lower board; for this is strictly the meaning of the Hebrew *bread of the presence*, *i.e.* bread set before the Lord; and whilst the other tribes were not so favoured, Levi was brought near, and allowed to eat at his master’s table.

When our Lord alluded to David’s having eaten the shew bread, He proceeded to give an instance of the sinless, because necessary, infraction of the letter, without breaking the spirit, of an ordinance, by the fact that the duty of the priest compelled him to break the Sabbath, and there is little doubt that the particular breach of the Sabbath which our Lord’s hearers understood Him to allude to, was, their baking the shew bread on the Sabbath; for the Rabbin had fully considered the point, and our Lord’s argument was unanswerable by the Scribes and Pharisees, because they had themselves ruled that breaking the Sabbath, in order to do God’s service, was blameless.



## XVII.

1. Sacrifice appealing to the Lord.—2. The memorial in the sacrifice.—3. The remembrance at the Eucharist.—4. The Passover household feast.—5. The Passover in the Temple.—6. The preparation.

1. THE sounds heard and the pomp seen on the occasion of divine service in the Garden of Eden were found expressed by the words *the voice of the Lord God walking* (mithallek) *in the garden* (Essay viii. p. 200). This apprehension of the meaning of that text is confirmed by our finding the same method of expression applied by the Psalmist to describe the pomp, delighting ear and eye, in the Temple service. *They have seen thy going* (mithallek), *O God, in the sanctuary* (Ps. lxviii. 25). *The singers go before, the minstrels follow.* This is the “*voice of the Lord God walking in the Temple.*”

The Psalm is reasonably supposed to describe the

solemn bringing in of the Ark, though it is not so apposite to it as the twenty-fourth Psalm is. It sounds equally of the procession of the high priest on the great Day of Atonement, when he officiated, across the Temple courts on his way into the sanctuary, the first or ante-tabernacle. Similar, in circumstances of civil pomp, was the procession of Solomon, going up to the house of the Lord, which struck with admiration the splendour-sated eyes of the Queen of Sheba (2 Chron. ix. 4).

The Jewish temperament, fed on notions of military prowess in the ancestors of the race, considered the sixty-eighth Psalm as an ἐπινίκιον, a song of triumph over devastated Ammon and Moab. The interpretation of it has been, as De Muis observes, *interpretum opprobrium*; but is not so if we take the Apostle's application of it. From it we learn that the mystery of the Psalm is Christ triumphant. In it we see pomp and melody in the Temple, as we see them in heaven (Rev. iv. v.). They cannot but be fit and becoming in the Church on earth; but when the Church desires for herself something of the pomp of the Temple, she should bear in mind that her Lord's seamless robe

must be dearer to her than the jewelled ephod of Aaron, which it excelled as the lilies of the field excelled in his eyes the gorgeous robes of Solomon.

Levi fills so large a space in the Old Testament, and the early Church moulded itself so on the Temple,\* that the persuasion soon came to her that the sacrifices of the Temple ritual had in them something more than unsubstantial shadows have, and she strove to deck her unornate but spiritual Eucharist with trappings from those carnal ordinances; not sufficiently considering that Melchizedek's ministration, and the ante-Levitical Passover, and not any Temple ceremonial or sacrifice, were the shadows of the Eucharist and of its origin. It is therefore useful to inquire of what things those Temple ceremonies and forms were shadows.

2. At a sacrifice (but not at the Passover sacrifice) a portion of fat mixed with incense was vaporized (*qatir*) by fire, and passed away wholly

\* Vitringa, in his very learned work *De Synagoga*, labours to prove that the services of the Church were founded on those of the Synagogue. The whole argument of his work proceeds on the assumption that the Eucharist is not a service in the Church; whereas Justin Martyr gives us no account of any primitive church service except one which concluded with the Eucharist.

in smoke; the disappearance of this vapour, by its absorption into the atmosphere, figured the ascent of the sacrifice to heaven, and its reception by the Lord. *Let my prayer be set before thee as vapour, qettoareth, i.e. incense smoke* (Ps. cxli. 2).

The act of vaporizing these substances with fire was called the *memorialising God* on behalf of the worshipper; and the thing itself the *memorial*, μνημόσυνον (πράγμα), the *reminding act*, azkarah, *making the Lord remember, or causing the sacrifice to be recorded*. From the accompanying perfume of the incense, *memorial* and *sweet savour* came to be synonymous in the Hebrew mind, and to signify *acceptability*.

Hence Christ is said to have *given Himself for us an offering and a sacrifice to God for a sweet-smelling savour* (Eph. v. 2). And they who are acceptable to God are *a sweet savour of Christ* to Him (2 Cor. ii. 15). They remind Him of Christ.

On the other hand, the Lord saith, *I will not smell in your solemn assemblies. Though ye offer me burnt offerings, I will not accept them* (Amos v. 21, 22; Lev. xxvi. 36).

In the Levitical sacrificial *memorial* the fat seems

to have typified a man's good deeds, the incense the merits of a Saviour: accordingly, man's righteousness alone is a mere *smoke in the nostrils*, but the merits of the Saviour make it a *sweet-smelling savour*.

The word *azkarah*, in fact, passed from meaning *memorial* to mean *perfume*, because the *memorial* at the offering attracted, as it were, the Lord's favourable notice of it and of the worshipper; so the perfume of a flower notifies us of its blooming and attracts our attention to it. Hence the idiom, *Let the Lord smell a sacrifice* (1 Sam. xxvi. 19).

We cannot doubt that the rite of burning incense at sacrifice prevailed before the Levitical law. We may probably recognise the *azkarah* with incense in Noah's sacrifice, when *the Lord smelled a sweet savour* (Gen. viii. 21), besides the note of acceptability given by the expression. In Abel's sacrifice one component of the *azkarah* is specially mentioned, *the fat*; in Cain's sacrifice, nothing indicating an *azkarah* is mentioned. The Lord did not kindle Cain's, but Abel's sacrifice.

If this is so, we may trace the *azkarah*, the *sweet peace-making savour*, *reeach hanicoah*, from Abel's



sacrifice to that of Christ, from the first use of the type to the swallowing up of the type by the reality, for St. Paul describes Christ's offering of himself for us to God, as the *azkarah* of the atonement, *a sweet-smelling savour* (Eph. v. 2).

By the *azkarah* the Lord was reminded of his Covenant, it is the *memorial*, *μνημόσυνον*.

3. In some writers may be noticed a want of precision in discriminating between those acts by which the Lord desired that his people should be reminded of Him, and those acts by which He desired that He should be reminded of them. The distinction is of great importance, for our Lord's words when He instituted the Eucharist, "*Do this in remembrance of me,*" made it an ordinance to serve the one or the other purposes, or it may be both.

The rainbow was appointed to serve both purposes, to make both the Lord and man remember; but man does not minister to the bending of the bow in the cloud; and our concern is with acts in which man ministers.

The blood sprinkled on the lintel and door-posts at the institution of the Passover in Egypt, was

for the purpose of *reminding the Lord, When I see the blood, I will pass over you* (Exod. xii. 13); but this act was not made a part of the ordinance, nor was any *memorial* appointed to the Paschal lamb, as to the daily lamb and other sacrifices.

When Moses said "This is the blood of the Covenant," it was to notify the ratification of it to the people, not to the Lord. Our Lord took up the words of Moses, to fulfil them, saying, *This cup is my blood of the new covenant*; and of an act made a perpetual ordinance; and those words, rehearsed at every celebration, remind people of the death of Christ, and declare the New Covenant to the people.

The people were to be reminded of the Lord by having Him mentioned to them as the *Lord God of Abraham, of Isaac, and of Jacob*: importing that those who worshipped and obeyed as those holy men did, worshipped and served the True God. *This, said the Lord, is my remembrance, zikri, ἐμὴ ἀνάμνησις, to generation after generation* (Exod. iii. 15). Similarly our Lord, instituting the Eucharist, said, *Do this in remembrance of me, εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν*, and the Apostle, in the words *till he*

come suggests the words *to generation after generation*, in Exod. as above. *This day*, said the Lord concerning the Passover when He instituted it, *shall be to you, for a reminder, lezikaron*, which, literally translated, is, *εἰς ἀνάμνησιν*. Pagninus translates it by *ad memoriam*, for the remembrance.

Confusion has been made from early times between the priest's *memorializing of the Lord* by some act or words which pleaded his Covenant on behalf of the worshipper, and the priest's *reminding men* of the Lord and of his Covenant by some act or words instituted by the Lord.

This confusion originated in the superstitious notion of the Jews that the Lord gave them his name to be uttered as a charm, compelling the exercise of his power on their behalf. Owing probably to this popular impression, the Septuagint have translated *zikri* (*the mention of me*) (Exod. iii.), *μνημόσυνον* instead of *ἐμὴ ἀνάμνησις*, omitting also the pronoun *my*.

And some see in the words *εἰς ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν*, *in remembrance of me*, the institution of a sacrificial memorial to God, such as that called in Hebrew *azkarah*, and translated *μνημόσυνον*.

The Septuagint, elsewhere sometimes careless, are very careful to translate *azkarah* *μνημόσυνον*, wherever the offering of a sacrifice is in question. Only where the censuring of the shew bread is spoken of (Lev. xxiv. 7) *azkarah* is translated *ἀνάμνησις*; and this because the shew bread was not offered as a sacrifice, by burning part of it with incense, but incense was put to it by means of a censer; it was censured. In Isaiah lxvi. 3, this is called *maschir libonah*, to make incense remind the Lord, in the Septuagint *δοῦναι λίβανον εἰς μνημόσυνον*, with which we may compare the angel's function at the altar, having a golden censer, ἵνα δώσῃ (θυμιάματα) ταῖς προσευχαῖς των ἁγίων, that he might add it (incense) to the prayers of the saints (Rev. iii. 3). So the prayers of the saints were censured as the shew bread was, and came up as the prayers and alms of Cornelius did for a memorial, *εἰς μνημόσυνον*, before God (Acts x. 5).

The merits of Christ, a sweet-smelling savour (Eph. v. 2), can be offered to God by Christ alone; He is the only High Priest, and He only is within the veil; his merits are the *memorial*, which He only is competent to offer; and it may be concluded that

when our Lord bade *do this εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν*, He did not institute a counterpart action to that of the Jewish priest offering the *μνημόσυνον*, nor ordered the Eucharist after the pattern of Levi, by indicating a memorial to be made with it, importing thereby the notion of offering the victim slain, as was done at every Levitical sacrifice; but after the pattern of the Passover in which was no sacrificial *memorial*.

In all sacrifices it was sacrilege to eat of the memorial; it was the sin of Eli's sons.

The Levitical priesthood drew the Passover feast into the Temple, and made a Levitical sacrifice of it as far as they could; but its specialities were, that it wanted two parts indispensable to make a Levitical sacrifice; there was no *memorial* appointed to it, nor any drink-offering (hin of wine). (Maimon. Præf. in Seder Menachoth.)

When therefore we would parallel the Eucharist with a Temple sacrifice, the analogy fails us. But we must parallel the Eucharist with the Passover, that is to say with that rite which was not a sacrifice, namely with the Feast of the Passover.

4. The Passover Feast was the seal of citizen-



ship ; not being Levitical, it was not affected by the ceremonial law in its details. It appears that any Israelite, ceremonially clean, could make ready the Passover Feast, as our Lord commissioned the two disciples to do, by killing the lamb required.

It is noticed (2 Chron. xxx. 17) *there were many in the congregation that were not sanctified : therefore the Levites had the charge of killing the Passover lambs, pesakim, for every one that was not clean, to sanctify them (i.e. the lambs, to cause the lambs to be clean) unto the Lord.* Whence it must be concluded that the Levites were spared the trouble by those of the congregation who were ceremonially clean.

At its first institution every head of a family killed the lamb. And such was probably the lawful custom in our Lord's days ; for though, at various periods, observances varied, yet we have every reason for believing that in our Lord's days ordinances and ritual were performed and followed more exactly after the original rubrics of their institution than at any other period in the Jewish Church ; being providentially so ordered, it being more than ever necessary that the *types* should

be exhibited accurately and distinctly, when He, whom each of them severally in its measure foreshadowed, and in whom all were to be consummated, had now come; that it might be the more clearly seen how *the things concerning Him* were fulfilled in Him, and how the substance answered to the shadow, the reality to the type.

In our Lord's days, and probably for ages before, the Passover was twofold, a household feast and a Temple ordinance.

As regards the household feast, we find that the Passover Feast was the great annual festival of the Jews. The festivity at it, in time, swallowed up the notion of the original solemnity, for in our Lord's days it was popularly called *Petscho*,\* *the*

\* The variations in the writing of this word are remarkable; the Samaritan Pentateuch writes *Pesach*, as does the Hebrew (the vowels now used in the word are only of Rabbinical authority). The Chaldee Targum writes *Pescha*, which is the Hebrew word with the Aramaic termination. The Septuagint, who write *Pascha*, seem to have given the sound of the word in their days.

The Peshito-Syriac writes *Petscho*, *rejoicing*, throughout, except at Ezra vi. 19, where it has the Hebrew letters of the word *Pesach*.

Symmachus sometimes writes *Phasec*, as does the Septuagint in the Book of Chronicles, in which books the plural, *pesachim*, is used for lambs for the Passover.

*Rejoicing*, a name that does not include in it any import of the Lord's passing over the houses of the Hebrews in Egypt.

At Deut. xvi. 2 we read, *thou shalt therefore sacrifice the Passover unto the Lord thy God, of the flock and of the herd* (sheep and ox in the Hebrew). The sheep for the Passover rite, the oxen for the Passover Household Feast.

The Household Feast concluded with the Passover formality. The guests stood up, and a minute portion of a (paschal) lamb (of the size of an olive, say the Rabbin) was eaten by each, with bitter herbs, and nothing could be eaten afterwards.

This may be inferred from the statement in the Talmud that the Paschal Supper, after the Household Feast, might not be concluded (as other feasts were) with fruit or sweets (*Vide* Buxtorf. "Vindic.

The word *pesak* passed into the Ethiopian Scriptures with the meaning merely of *joy* attached to it, for the Ethiopian Gospel writes, *they on the rock are they that receive the word with pesak, joy* (St. Luke viii. 13). We may suppose that the feast held its ground among the people, but that its religious essence was lost in their minds. And as it was the first and the most frequented of those three great festivals at which it is commanded, *Thou shalt rejoice*, it was natural to the people to call it emphatically *the rejoicing*, Petscho, without any further idea.

Exerc. de Cœnâ Domini," p. 363). The Household Feast, concluded by the Passover formality, was the universal national observance of the Passover; its celebration was limited to Jerusalem.

We thus recognise in the Feast of the Passover two parts; the feasts at which the flesh of oxen was eaten; the Paschal supper, at which the lamb and the bitter condiment alone could be eaten; and of the Paschal lamb a portion of the size of an olive (the standard of a minimum of observance in all material components of a duty) was reckoned to be sufficient, and was usually eaten.

At the last Passover Feast of our Lord and his disciples, we can recognise three parts: first, the household feast; for which oxen are spoken of as required (2 Chron. xxxv. 8). Then, secondly, *δείπνου γενομένου*, *supper being ended*, our Lord rises from the supper (John xiii. 4), washes the disciples' feet; then, *αναπέσων πάλιν*, *sitting down again*, He proceeded to the actual Passover, and gave the first portion of the Paschal lamb, *ψώμιον*, dipped into the bitter herbs (Exod. xii. 8), to Judas Iscariot. Thirdly, Judas having gone out, our Lord instituted the Eucharist. *Postquàm typicum pascha fuerat*

*impletum, ad veræ Paschæ transgreditur sacramentum* (St. Jerome on Matt. xxvi. 26).

5. The Levitical ceremonial incorporated the Passover into its ordinances, and there was therefore necessarily a Passover sacrifice and Paschal feast in the Temple; which was partaken of by the priests confined to the Temple on that day by their duties. It was these priests, directly concerned and active in seizing our Lord, who, not being required to be on duty till the third hour, to offer the morning daily lamb, were at leisure to take our Lord early in the morning to Pilate, but would not enter the Judgment Hall, lest, in so doing, contracting some ceremonial uncleanness, they should be unfit to celebrate and eat the Passover that day.

Therefore these priests intended keeping the Passover that day, sacrificing it in the Temple; it was therefore the canonical day, by the Temple calendar, the day on which Christ our Passover was to be sacrificed for us.

But all the priests did not keep the Passover on that day, for there were some standing by at our Lord's crucifixion; and not only this, but some priests went to Pilate to complain of the terms of



the title, *King of the Jews*, affixed by his orders to our Lord's cross. It is impossible that these priests could have kept the Passover that day. For our Lord was crucified at noon, and expired at three o'clock; and the Passover sacrifice had to be offered between the two evenings, or westerings of the sun.

The first evening began at the sun's moving westward from the meridian, that is to say, as soon as noon was past. The second evening began when the sun had moved westward from the horizon, had set, which occurs at six o'clock at Easter, therefore three o'clock being between the two evenings, was the canonical hour of offering the Paschal lamb.

The Temple Passover day fell on Friday that year, so that the next day was the Sabbath; and as the Sabbath began at sunset on Friday, the Passover had to be sacrificed in haste that day, as at its first institution, that the lamb might be roasted and consumed and the bones burnt, and all concluded before six o'clock that evening, for then it was Sabbath.

This hurried disposal of the Paschal lamb, necessitated by the coming in of the Sabbath three hours after it had been sacrificed, had its parallel in the

circumstance of the burial of our Lord in haste ; and hurried as his entombment was, it was only concluded just as the Sabbath lights from the Temple announced the Sabbath.\*

6. The word *παρασκευή* occurs only twice in the Septuagint ; the Vulgate has not translated it. It is applied to the furniture of the Tabernacle, and stands either for the Hebrew *m'leecheth*, *performance*, or for *haghabōda*, *the work, the work of the service*, in the English version. The word also occurs 2 Macc. xvi. 21, τῶν ὀπλῶν τὴν ποικίλην παρασκευὴν, *the varied array of arms*. An ancient glossary explains the word by *ἐντροπισμός*, *good array*.

\* In St. John we read, *There laid they Jesus therefore, because of the Jews' preparation-day ; for the sepulchre was nigh at hand* (xix. 42.) But the Syriac reads, *And there they laid Jesus because the Sabbath was coming on, and because the sepulchre was near, without alluding to the preparation-day ; the difference is remarkable, and makes us suspect the clause about the preparation to be a gloss from the margin by some scribe*. Similarly, where in St. Mark we read, *When the even was come, because it was the preparation, that is the day before the Sabbath* (xv. 42), this last clause is not in the Sinaitic MS., nor in some others, and may also be suspected to be from the margin, and the more reasonably because the Syriac at the place reads, *When it was late on the hroobtha, which is before the Sabbath*.

The uses of the word perhaps justify us in translating παρασκευὴ τοῦ πάσχα, *the celebration of the Passover*, in the Temple, its present preparedness.

It is possible that the word παρασκευή is used of the Temple sacrifice, in contradistinction to the ἑορτή, the household feast, at the Passover.

The Peshito-Syriac most probably preserved the very Aramaic word applied to the event in our Lord's days, *h'roobtha*, which cannot be translated making ready.

The word has been treated by translators as if it had been προπαρασκευή, preparation beforehand, and as if the Jews had *eves* of feasts and Sabbaths, as the Church has. In her calendar the eve of Easter is part of the day before. But the Jewish Easter-day began at six o'clock on what we call the preceding day, so that the eve of the Passover day, when it fell on Friday, was at six o'clock on the Thursday evening.

St. John says that it was παρασκευή about noon of the day on which the priests intended eating the Passover. This excludes the notion of the word's meaning the evening before or the day before.

If the evening of that day is called παρασκευή

in accounting for the suspension of work at our Lord's sepulchre, it must mean that the Sabbath was actually being then kept, otherwise the work might have been proceeded with. The conclusion is that the word is not *preparation*, but is said of the Paschal sacrifice and of the Sabbath, in the several places, as actually in hand.

At the hour when our Lord was being fixed to the cross it was the *parasceue* of the Passover; as our Lord's burial was concluded it was again *parasceue*, known to be so by the lighting of the Temple lamps, τὸ σάββατον ἐπέφωσκε; this then was the *parasceue* of the Sabbath. The first of these *parasceuai* was separated from the other by the interval of six hours at least, nine at most.

The first means *preliminaries of the Passover* rites, the second *preliminaries of the Sabbath* rites. The preliminaries of our Lord's death coincided in point of time with those of the Temple Passover; the preliminaries of his entombment (for it was not completed) with those of the day of rest.

Friday was called *παρασκευή* by the fathers. "Creator in biduum legi manna solummodo permisit in *parasceue*" (Tertull. adv. Marcionem. iv.)

And especially of Good Friday, as by St. Athanasius on the Psalms. St. Epiphanius calls Friday *προσάββατον*, a word occurring in the Book of Judith, meaning the day before the Sabbath, but expressing rather the first part of the Sabbath. But it does not follow that because Good Friday is called *Parasceue* that the Temple Passover was not celebrated on that day, let *Parasceue* mean what it may.

The feast being an ordinance to the people, the sacrifice specially to the priests, the former could be regulated as to time by the civil, the latter by the canonical calendar; and the feast, like the new moon feast, could be lawfully kept on either of two days (see 1 Sam. xx. 26, 27).

By the civil reckoning the moon was accounted new fourteen days after full moon day; but in the Temple reckoning the moon could not be proclaimed new until it had actually been seen eastward of the sun. Consequently the canonical fourteenth day of the moon, the Passover-day, would sometimes be the fifteenth day of the civil calendar month, the moon not having been seen on the very day of conjunction with the sun; and this would happen when



the conjunction took place at sunset ; for then the moon would not be perceptible till the second day. Hence our Lord could eat the Passover *feast* with his disciples lawfully on the fourteenth day, and could himself be the Paschal lamb of *sacrifice* slain on the next day, expiring at the ninth hour, between the two evenings, at the time when the Paschal sacrifice was being celebrated in the Temple.

## XVIII.

1. Conventional and popular notions of the status of the Israelites.
- 2. Of the means of access of the Jew to the mind of the Lord.—3. The more sure access of the Christian.

1. MEN have subordinated the character and moral government of the Lord to the dignity and consistency of an ideal people of the Lord, the Jews of the Old Testament times, reckoning that they must have rightly understood Him, because they might have done so.

Ceremonial precepts were within the scope of their capacity, but God's moral law was far above, out of their sight; and so they accepted directions involving the breach of a commandment, as though they came from the Lord; but rejected a precept involving a breach of the ceremonial law, as though it was a suggestion from the adversary; a perversity pointed out to them by our Lord, Matt. xv.

Men also who, without hesitation, set the Christian far above the Jew in spiritual privileges, theoretically, yet, really, recognise in the condition of the Jew a special advantage over the Christian in having had prophets to direct him with advice from the Lord, and priests to consult who could ask God concerning the man's doubts. This perhaps expresses fairly one of those opinions, felt to be inconsistent, yet acquiesced in by the generality. It is of the same class as the notion on which so many professors act, that obedience was required of the Jews, and belief only of the Christians.

The Jewish conception of a partiality of the Lord for them, as a race, the descendants of Abraham's body, as unchangeable as his favour to the representatives of Abraham's faith, has prevailed widely; it is a trace of the infusion of the Jewish mind through the Septuagint into the Church.

The interpreter of Scripture has little to do with forecasting their future destiny; but he is greatly interested in ascertaining how their popular view of their own vocation and spiritual position affected their apprehension of the Word of God, and has affected ours.

It is very plain from Scripture that Abraham, from having been originally *a Syrian ready to perish* (Deut. xxvi. 5), was made the father of God's people, not that the Levitical law might operate among his descendants, nor that the kingdom of Solomon might be established over his posterity, but simply in order that he might acknowledge Christ, whose day he saw and was glad; and, consequently, every descendant of Jacob who did not acknowledge Christ, in his day, went back into the condition of Syrians; so that Caiaphas was *the Canaanite in the house of the Lord* (Zech. xiv. 21) when he returned to it from Herod's hall of judgment.

The duration of the Israelitish race seems to have been portioned by the Lord into spaces of time in which one after another of the links in his revealed perfections (Exod. xxiv. 6) might be exemplified, *mercy* in the calling of Abraham; *grace* (*favour that thou bearest unto thy people*) (Ps. cvi. 4), in bringing his posterity out of Egypt; *long-suffering*, in tolerating them from the day on Sinai to the night on the Mount of Olives; *goodness*, in being born among them to save them; *faithfulness* in redeeming them on Calvary.

Their existence as a people was a tolerated necessity, to give time for types to appear and evidence to accumulate, and prophecies to be enrolled among the folds of time, so many and such, that no one could answer to them all, except only the promised One.

Joshua with five kings his captives; Jael murdering her too confident guest; Solomon, in the splendours of peace, and the Queen of Sheba in its softnesses; these are idols of those who read Scripture that they may admire the heroes of this world; but if we would read Scripture that we may discern the men of God, we must look on Moses lamenting the weight of dignity, saying, *Wherefore hast thou afflicted thy servant that thou layest the burden of all this people on me? Kill me, I pray thee, out of hand, and let me not see my wretchedness* (Num. xi. 1—15); or on Elijah, uncouth as John the Baptist, *his raiment camel's hair, and girt with a girdle of leather* (2 Kings i. 8), requesting for himself that he might die, saying, *It is enough, O Lord, take away my life* (1 Kings xix. 4); or on Jeremiah exclaiming, *I am a man that hath seen afflictions* (Lam. iii. 1); or Boaz greeting



his labourers ; or Hannah clothing her child Samuel ; Barzillai feeding King David ; Obadiah sheltering prophets ; Uriah making the earth his bed for conscience' sake ; Ebed Melech raising Jeremiah from the noisome pit ; Israelites without guile, though not all Hebrews of the Hebrews.

This enumeration is not that given (Heb. xi.) of some who exemplified faith, but of some who put in use a more excellent gift, charity ; and therefore of characters more godlike ; for those who excel in charity must be above those who excel in faith ; since charity is greater than faith, the Apostle will approve the choice. Nor shall we err if we say to Joshua, *put up thy sword into its sheath, they that take the sword shall perish with the sword* ; or to Solomon, *take off the diadem, remove the crown* ; and judge that either would have better known the Lord, if one had shed no blood, the other felt no pride. If we would carry the Gospel into the Old Testament we must subject much of the conventional reading of its meaning to such a process as this. The *letter* is but the flesh of the record, and the flesh must be subdued to the spirit.

2. In comparing the channels of communication from the Lord provided for the guidance of the Jewish Church, with those vouchsafed and opened up for the guidance of the Christian Church, it is too readily assumed that the prophet has no place in the Christian dispensation.

The point cannot be assumed; the action of the prophet in the Jewish Church must first be clearly ascertained.

Prophets such as Elijah and Isaiah do not belong to the class of prophets under consideration; the Church undoubtedly had a greater than Elijah in John the Baptist, and a greater than Isaiah and his fellows in the Apostles, as she had a greater than Moses in *the one Mediator between God and men Christ Jesus, so far as He was man, as Moses was.*\*

But the question is as to the priest prophet who was to show the people the Word of God in their doubts or perplexities; an audible expositor (nabi) of the written Scripture, showing the people the spirit,

\* This is the meaning of the text, *one mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus* (1 Tim. ii. 5); the Greek has no article before *man*.

which had been embalmed in the letter that it might be preserved unaltered among men.

To admit that the Christian Church has not advantages, equal to those of the Jewish Church, in ascertaining the mind of the Lord; and that the members of that Church have not equally trustworthy channels of communication with the Lord, when they desire to know the truth in doubtful questions; would be to disparage the operation of the Holy Ghost, who substitutes to us Christ, as one who can be *asked of the matter* (Mark x. 10), as our Lord used to be by his disciples.

He, when about to depart, informed his disciples that, after his departure, *in that day*, the day of the Holy Ghost, which followed the day of Christ, and is the present phase of the dispensation of grace, they should ask Him (Christ) nothing ἐμὲ οὐκ ἐρωτήσετε,\* *ye shall not inquire of me*, but He meant them to understand that they should then have a guide unto truth, the Holy Ghost of whom they should inquire, ἐπηρωτᾶν, concerning any matter of faith

\* We must distinguish between ἐρωτήσετε, *inquire*, and αἰτήσητε, *ask*, or make requests in my name (xiv. 14).

or practice, for they should *all be taught of God* the Holy Ghost.

We must not make the mistake, which the Jews made, of supposing that the prophet was a minister of God, appointed to advise them in their temporal affairs, or to tell them beforehand what would be the result of such or such speculations and measures taken ; *the children of this world are wiser in their generation than the children of light* in theirs. The worldly prudent man is not the weakly child of grace ; it is the latter who needs the advice which the Spirit offers. The prophet was appointed to give counsel to the latter.

The Jews, not apprehending this, disappointed in their prophets, had recourse to wizards, as Saul had. And that people, who might have become the wisest of the children of light, have preferred becoming the wisest of the children of this world.

The prophet, restored in our conceptions to the place and functions which the Lord intended for him, cannot be considered equal to the spiritual pastor in the Church of Christ ; nor a Jew, rightly desiring spiritual guidance from lawful and authorised lips, be reckoned so favourably circumstanced

for obtaining it as the faithful member of the Christian Communion is ; otherwise the dispensation of the law would have been better than the ministration of the Spirit ; for the Jewish prophet priest ministered the law, but the Christian priest *ministers the Spirit*. (Gal. iii. 5 ; 2 Cor. iii. 7, 8.)

St. Peter reckons the Church to enjoy two special advantages, *a more sure word of prophecy*, and, *prophecy of Scripture* (2 Peter i. 19, 20) ; προφητικὸν λόγον, spoken instructions *to which ye do well that ye take heed* ; and προφητείας γραφῆς, the written Scriptures.

The Apostle bids us bear in mind that the utterance of the prophet *ιδίας ἐπιλύσεως οὐ γίνεται*, is *not of the prophet's own suggestion* ; and lest he should not be rightly understood (for ἐπίλυσις is usually applied to setting the sense loose from an obscure saying) he subjoins, in order to explain what he means by *ιδία ἐπίλυσις*, *they spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost*, who opened their mouths and loosed their tongues.

Of Zacharias we read *ανεώχθη δέ το στόμα αὐτοῦ καὶ ἡ γλῶσσα αὐτοῦ* (where we must supply *ἐλύθη* as at Mark vii. 36, *ἐλύθη ὁ δεσμός τῆς γλώσσης*



αὐτοῦ), *his mouth was opened and his tongue loosed, and he prophesied* (Luke i. 64, 67).

The word ἐπιλυσίς is very properly applied to the solution by the prophet of mysteries in Scripture or in Providence (which solutions are the staple of the prophetic writings), and not to our solution or interpretation of the prophets' writings.

It is also plain that St. Paul assigns prophecy to the ministers of Christ, as one of the gifts of the Spirit to the Church; the Council of Jerusalem asserted its inspiration, nor can it be denied to the Council of Nicæa.

Prophecy is what it is according as it is received. The prophecy of Caiaphas, that it was expedient that one, viz., Jesus, should die, rather than that all the people should perish, was the destruction of the people in the sense in which the Sanhedrim accepted it; for the murder of our Lord was the ruin of the Jewish people. But it was and is salvation to those who receive it *in an honest and good heart*, as the truth that Christ died for all men, though spoken by one who knew not what he said nor meant to say it. In the case of the Jew, the dew fell on a heart of stone; the plainer the appeal made to them the

harder it made, *i. e.* proved, their heart to be. This is the statement of the Lord on the subject, not our judgment of that unhappy people, so truly deserving of our pity and lenient judgment.

The advantage which the believer in the Saviour of Jew and Gentile was to have over the Jew under the law was declared to be that this heart of stone should be removed and a heart capable of receiving impressions given in its stead (Ezek. xi. 19). *I will take the stony heart out of their flesh and will give them a heart of flesh*; a heart not like the tables on which the commandments were written, unconscious of their import and value, but a heart that would understand the precepts impressed upon it. So much more accessible than the Jew to prophecy and the appeals of the Lord was the Christian to be. We call the heart, *conscience*; Josiah's conscience is described as tenderness of *heart* in him.

It was the weakness of the law that it gave orders but did not give sensibility to the conscience; in the Jew the conscience was dead; this deadness of conscience Moses and St. Stephen call *the uncircumcised heart*.

At baptism, *the true circumcision* of the Spirit, the promised heart of flesh, that is to say of susceptibility to the impact of the Spirit, is given. The *conscience is purified from dead works*. The favour bestowed at baptism is the regeneration of what Wycliffe, writing English, called *in-wit*; it is that which in the Anglo-Latin authorised version is called *conscience*.

The conscience, which has lost its vitality, obtains a new birth at baptism, which is the virtue of the resurrection of Christ applied to a dead principle or part in man, introductory to the resurrection of the whole faculties and body of man.

This is what St. Peter teaches. According to the Apostle, baptism does not give the advantage of relief from carnal corruption, it is *not the putting away of the filth of the flesh* (which circumcision and the Levitical dispensation was concerned with), but baptism gives the privilege of appealing to God with a good conscience, with the boldness which confidence in Christ gives.

St. Peter contrasts the flood and the ark, a *figure*, or semblable shadow, with baptism, a reality and substantial thing; and defines baptism as *συνειδήσεως*

αγάθης ἐπερώτημα εἰς Θεὸν\* (*the answer of a good conscience towards God*, E. V.), a conscience answerable to the image and likeness which the Creator gave it at the beginning, for it has been *created anew* in Christ Jesus. Bengel explains the words to mean, “a clean conscience when making inquiry of God;” they mean, *the privilege of appealing to God with a good conscience.*

And thus the active conscience is made an acceptable inquirer of the Spirit, in its appeals; the conscience, passive, a responsive recipient of the dictates of the Spirit. This is the condition which, if lost, *it is impossible to renew again* (Heb. vi. 4) by any ordinances ministered to by the Church. By this special susceptibility of conscience the Christian can learn the will of God as to his duty and its details far more readily and surely than the Jew could by inquiring of the Lord through a priest or by going to a prophet to consult him.

\* Ἐπερωτᾶν is strictly applicable to *asking advice* of an oracle or spiritual director. St. Peter wrote conformably with his vernacular Aramaic diction ἐπερώτημα εἰς Θεὸν, where we should expect ἐπερ. Θεῶν, *inquiry of God, appeal to God*; for verbs such as *shaal* and *darash*, which ἐπερωτᾶν translates, allow of the prefix *l*, εἰς, to the person consulted.

And the Christian has in Christ's ministers those who can *show him the sentence of judgment* (Deut. xvii. 9) *and ask counsel for him after the judgment of Light (Urim)* (Numb. xxvii. 21), more plainly and profitably than the Jew had in the priest, if the minister answers him out of the Gospel and not out of the schoolmen.

The Jews of one age thought that if they had lived in another age, when God spoke to Moses, and the pillar of the cloud led the people, and the manna fed them, that they would have known and done the will of God. The Christian, perhaps, has often thought that if he had an Elijah, or a high priest to consult, their answers would silence doubts, and banish heresies, and solve mysteries.

All such notions belong to the disparagement of his present position compared with that of former men, which is common to every generation, and which the Preacher rebuked, saying, *Say not thou, What is the cause that the former days were better than these? For thou dost not enquire wisely concerning this* (Ec. vii. 10.) The opinion, however, has certainly been strong enough to make men form an exaggerated opinion of the Jewish prophet and



priest as the oracles of inquirers ; and has prevented their seeing that in many cases the record, *the Lord said*, is merely the record, by a blind people accepting ecclesiastical assertions as the Word of God, made in a conventional formula.

Conscience was altogether inert in the Jew. It is ever spoken of in the New Testament, but both word and thing are unknown to the diction of the Old Testament ; the Hebrew offers us no word by which to express it. The Septuagint has *συνέιδσις* once only (Ex. x. 20), where it means *unspoken thought*. It is described in Hebrew as one of the accidents of *the heart* ; *David's heart smote him* for having numbered the people, but not till the prophet Gad had denounced the act. He heard Nathan's parable without any misgivings of conscience. He prayed afterwards for a *clean heart, a conscience purified from dead works* ; and the expression he uses, *Purge me with hyssop*, refers to the sprinkling of the blood of the Passover lamb in Egypt on the door-posts, or to the ratifying of the covenant by Moses, not to any Levitical ordinance, for *Thou requirest no sacrifice, else would I give it Thee* (Ps. li.). Where a breach of the moral law, the commandments, had been

committed, the Levitical sacrifices were impotent. Its ordinances were for the outward man, those of the Gospel for the inner man, and of these, the first revives the energy of the conscience.

It is by this revived conscience that the promise *They shall teach no more every man his brother, saying, Know the Lord, for all shall know me, from the least to the greatest* (Jer. xxxi. 34) is possible of fulfilment; which is the promise made to men on the making of a new covenant with them. And this knowledge, the discernment of what is good in the sight of the Lord from what is evil in his sight, is *the highway, and the way* in which *the wayfaring men, though fools, shall not err* (Is. xxxv. 8).

Nor would Christians err, as they so commonly do, if they did not go beyond Scripture, and represent the Lord as saying, that the simplest-minded shall not err *in choosing a way*, whereas He saith, in walking in a way which He has chosen for them.

## XIX.

1. Christ's promise of reply to prayer.—2. The name of the Lord.  
—3. His name proclaimed before the Commandments were published.

1. THE consideration of man's access to the Lord introduces the subject of his approach to Him as a petitioner with the warrant, *Whatsoever ye shall ask the Father, in my name, He will give it you* (John xvi. 22).

Liberty can be enjoyed only when licence is controlled. All things whatsoever which a man can desire and ask for are unlimited in number and kind; but all things whatsoever he can ask for in Christ's name are limited; he is restricted to those things which Christ came to give.

St. John would not have us pray for one who had sinned a sin unto death (1 John v. 16). There was something, whatever it was, which the Apostle advised men not to pray for. "The Lord," says

Bengel, "will not have the godly make fruitless prayers."

Many of our wishes, like many of our notions, are but weeds and tares, that spring up of themselves in a fertile mind. The Spirit, answering prayer, waters only the seed of life.

The notions that if we pray for fruitful seasons we pray that the course of nature may be altered, and that we may know whether Christ's promise can be trusted by choosing a thing to be prayed for, and seeing whether we obtain it in reply to prayer, are of these weeds and tares that are likely to choke the growing seed of life in us. It is evident that our Lord had in view the things needful to his Church, not the private wants of individuals, when He promised the bestowal of whatever was asked for in his name. According to his teaching, the kingdom of God was first to be sought for, and all other things necessary to the individual subject of the kingdom would be *added* to the gift of righteousness (Mat. vi. 33).

She owes the comfort of the Holy Ghost to the prayers of Christ, *I will pray the Father, and He will give you another Comforter.* The ages of the Church

that have been since the days of Christ have owed more to the prayers, unrecorded, of Christ, offered for yet unborn generations of believers, than those generations profited by his recorded teaching. And next to those prayers, to the prayers of the saint in his closet.

There has ever been a life in the Church, retired and unheard of, like the life of the mother of our Lord ; the life of the men of secret prayer, whose services to the Church have been as those of the mother of Jesus were to Him ; as essential as they are unrecorded.

To such the Church has mainly owed her permanency, and not to such helps as the patronage of Constantine or the decrees of Nicæa. The patriarch in council helped the necessities of the Church less than the solitary in his cell did. The Church owes all she has been and all she has to prayer, she has not come short of the glory of God because it was not asked for her, but because she has sometimes forfeited, sometimes squandered the gift.

Promises were made and hope held out to encourage men to pray, first, as a Church, for the Church ; next as members one of another, for those of the



household of faith and for all their fellow men ; and, lastly, individuals for themselves ; for self ever comes last in the kingdom of heaven, as it comes first in the world.

Our Lord is our pattern in respect of asking of God for ourselves, as in all other respects. We observe then, first, that Christ controlled Himself in asking, *Thinkest thou that I cannot now pray to my Father, and He shall presently give me more than twelve legions of angels ?* (Matt. xxvi. 53) ; able to obtain, He yet refrained from asking, because the gift, if granted, would have hindered the work which He had been sent to do. *But how then shall the Scriptures be fulfilled, that thus it must be ?* And in that most affecting utterance, *Now is my soul troubled, and what shall I say, &c.* (John xii. 27), He collected himself, as it were, that He might not in praying speak undvisedly.

Here, surely, are matters to make the Church and individuals pause, and ask themselves if there are not plain limits to the *whatsoever*. Our Lord Himself, in his own case, limited it to such things as were consistent with his office and its work, excluding from it all that might hinder it, if granted.

The Church may therefore well be asked to refrain from asking for temporal power, for the kingdom of her Lord is not temporal; if she asks for civil authority she asks for that which has not been assigned to her. And if she asks and has it not, it is because only whatsoever is necessary and useful in her assigned vocation is covenanted to be given to her.

Similarly with individuals who ask with faith and do not obtain what they ask for. Faith may be unwavering though it is ignorant. Probably the faith of ignorance is far more unhesitating than that of knowledge.

When St. James accounts for prayers unanswered by asserting that they must have been requests for things which men intended to spend on their *lusts*, he means by lusts, not sinful desires, but things necessary only for a life such as men list to live; not needful for the life and work assigned to men by Him who has given *every man his work*. Counsels of perfection would rule that a Christian ought to be content to ask for such things as satisfied Christ when on earth; for *it is enough for the servant to be as his Lord*; and that he should exclude from the

*whatsoever* of the promise *whatsoever* he sees that his Master did not ask for for Himself. And this limitation is the more reasonable because when a man asks rightly in Christ's name, he is, in the sight of God, as though he were Christ himself asking. As he has thus *put on Christ*, he must, with Christ, take Christ's abstinence in asking for himself.

2. There must, however, be a lawful extent allowable to the *whatsoever we ask*. It must cover the attributes of God which have been proclaimed as imitable by man; and which have been enumerated as Grace, Mercy, Long-suffering, Goodness, and Faithfulness. The Lord who proclaimed these as his name, who commanded persons to be baptised into his name, is the Lord Jesus Christ *ὁ ἀπὸς*, *He who is, yesterday, to-day, and for ever* (Heb. xiii. 8). Christ has given us his name, not merely to be used as a password, when we would approach God, but also with his name He has given all that it has been revealed as containing; as much of every proclaimed divine perfection as the shallow and narrow measure of man's spiritual capacity can receive, is the extent and also the limit of the *whatsoever* which

we are allowed to be certain of receiving when we ask for it in the name of Christ.

All things which we feel to be desirable for us, we may lawfully pray for, as the Apostle teaches us; but he bids us know that the result will be this, that if we do not obtain them, we shall be pacified and satisfied by knowing that they are things not intended for us, because they are not given to us, as was the case with his own thrice-repeated supplication (2 Cor. xii. 8).

The promised liberality of the Lord to those who pray to Him is measured by the faith of the suppliant, and dealt out in the substance of the components of his name.

If He had proclaimed his name as the God of armies, the soldier would obtain victory by asking for it; if of wealth, the miser would obtain his desires. If Christ had come into the world to heal the sick, the sick could be healed whenever he prayed for health with faith.

It seems as though there were a mine of spiritual wealth to be opened to them who would wisely contemplate the NAME of the LORD, as revealed and proclaimed.

The import of the term, *the name of the Lord*, is a mystery in the New Testament, as well as in the Old. We are the more perplexed by translators, for in the ordinance of baptism, when instituted by Christ (Matt. xxviii. 19), it is directed to be baptism *in the name*, though the words are *εἰς τὸ ὄνομα*, which in the Acts are translated *in the name*, as though it were *by the authority of the Lord*; but elsewhere Christians are said to be baptized *into the name*, though the words are the same as those of St. Matthew, and those used by the writer of the Acts, *εἰς τὸ ὄνομα*, *into the name*.

We are helped to find an excellent sense in the expression *baptized into the name of the Lord* by the saying *the name of the Lord is a strong tower; the righteous runneth into it, and is safe* (Prov. xviii. 10), fleeing from the wrath to come.

The sense is still more fruitful if we conceive of our admission into the fellowship of Christ to be a baptism into grace, mercy, forbearance, goodness, and truth; for these are the components of the name of the Lord.

The *name of the Lord*, in Scripture diction, is equivalent to *the Lord*. The enunciation of his



perfections is an expansion of his name; grace, mercy, forbearance, goodness, and truth, are the shadows of his wings. He does not offer Himself to our conception as a dazzling centre of light, but as an expansion, within which all perfections are contained. Man is as a worm, for he can range over but a very small space of that which God fills (*do I not fill heaven and earth? saith the Lord*, Jer. xxiii. 24); higher creatures, the many-winged Seraphim, range wider, and soar into the knowledge of wider perfections, than man does, the knowledge of them being the practice of them.

3. The expansion of God's name into the perfections (Exod. xxxiv. 6) was the development of promises. Grace, mercy, and long-suffering, were proclaimed because they were then promised to his people. And the Apostle would have us know that salvation is a thing which we do not work out for ourselves, but which is given by promise to the faithful.

Now, as the Apostle makes it of such importance that we should remember that the promise was given before the law of works was added, it is but consistent in us to understand that the Lord pro-

claimed his name on Mount Sinai before He spoke the commandments.

Had He not first proclaimed his name, the Israelites might have asked when called on to obey his commandments, *who is the Lord, that I should obey his voice ?* As Pharaoh did, to whom He had not revealed his name; or as Moses reasoned, when commissioned, after the people had escaped from Egypt, to conduct them to the promised land (Exod. xxxiii. 12), *wherein shall it be known here that I and Thy people have found grace in Thy sight ?* and requested the Lord to show him his glory (ver. 18).

This occurrence must refer to a period before the giving and breaking of the first tables; for the Lord then promised that his presence should go with the people (ver. 14), whereas, after the tables were broken, He withdrew his presence, and sent his angel to guide them, to the great disappointment of the people (xxxiii. 4). So that we have, in this occurrence, an additional confirmation of the fact that the name of the Lord was proclaimed before the commandments were given; which it is also reasonable to suppose was done that the Israel-

ites might know the disposition of Him who was about to require their obedience.

It by no means appears, on the face of the book Exodus that the Lord proclaimed his name (chap. xxxiv.) before He spoke the commandments (chap. xx.), but the contrary; for the text of that book lies before us as the complete but disjointed ichthyosaurus lies on the rock which has formed around and over him.

The ruling error of the Jews, according to St. Paul, was, that they sought to attain to righteousness by attempting the works of the commandments, not by building with confidence on the promises of God (Rom. viii. 31), whereas Abraham attained to it by trusting to the promises.

This having been the ruling error of the Jews, we find, as we might expect, that the publication of the commandments has had a separate dignity assigned to it (which their importance merits), but the proclamation of God's name has no distinct outline, as a revelation from the Lord of such importance should have had circumscribed round it, to keep it separate from other matter. When we perceive that it should be set forth with definiteness,

the text helps us to frame it into a consistent whole.

In Exodus (xxiv. 15), Moses goes up into Mount Sinai, which was covered by a cloud for six days. On the seventh God calls to Moses, and he goes up into the midst of the cloud (ver. 18).

Here the subject breaks off; but we pick up the next link (xxxiv. 5), and it articulates exactly into ver. 18, chap. xxiv.

Moses went up into the midst of the cloud (xxiv. 18, xxxiv. 5), and the Lord descended in the cloud, and proclaimed the name of the Lord. And the Lord passed before him and proclaimed.

*The Lord, the Lord God, merciful and gracious, long-suffering, and abundant in goodness and truth.* Here, for the first time, God is revealed in his attributes. Here, *the fulness of God* for the filling of his people with goodness, is shown. Here, his name *is as ointment poured out*, and every page of revelation, and all the garments of salvation, smell of it (Ps. xlv. 8). The counterpart to this event is the transfiguration of our Lord, when *a cloud overshadowed them and they feared as they entered into the cloud, and there came a voice*

*out of the cloud, saying, This is my beloved Son, hear Him.*

In the New Covenant the transfiguration answers to the proclamation of the Lord's name on Sinai; as the sermon on the Mount answers to the giving of the ten commandments.

The usual arrangement of the matter in Exodus, at these places, is, as though the healing of the demoniac child, at the foot of Mount Tabor, had been interpolated between the appearance of the cloud overshadowing the mount and the proclamation of Jesus as the Son of God by the voice out of the cloud.

The rough places will never be made smooth by the removal of stumbling blocks, nor the pits, *not after the law*, dug by the ungodly, into which they who have set forth the Scriptures have fallen and dragged in others, ever be filled up till *the line* is laid on the level of the promises, not of the commandments.

When the Apostle called for faith without works, he desired that men should have confidence in the Lord's keeping his promises, not confidence in their own keeping the commandments, as the substance of their hopes.



The Lord's developed name is all matter of promise. The proclamation of mercy, long-suffering, grace, and faithfulness, are essentially promises of them to be exemplified in his government of his people. There is no other object conceivable as that which the Lord had in publishing his name, unless we apprehend it to have been made that men might know what they should aim at imitating in dealing with their fellow men, the principles on which the Lord promised to deal with them. These are *the promises of God* which St. Paul declares the law did not interfere with (Gal. iii. 21).

By recapitulating the stages of development in the enunciation of the name of God to men, we obtain a clear view of the correctness of the order to be observed in receiving the revelation.

First, the Lord, making a promise to Abraham, announced Himself to Abraham as Almighty, that Abraham might know that being such, He was able to perform a promise apparently improbable and impossible of fulfilment (Gen. xv.).

After the promise came the commandment, *Walk before me, and be thou perfect* (Gen. xvii. 1).

Next, to Moses, the Almighty added to that

attribute the Eternal, Jehovah (Exod. vi. 3), that Moses might know that it was the *I AM* who made the promise to Abraham, and who then renewed it.

Then followed the enunciation of the excellencies of the Eternal.

And it was on these excellencies, and on this proclamation of them, that the first and greatest of all commandments, but *not one of the ten*, is founded, namely, *Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart*. Thus it appears that the first and most important of all the commandments is not any one of the ten written on the tables of stone. And this is so, because the highest commandment springs from promises; but no commandment of the Ten does. *It was added because of transgressions*.

As regards the Lord's attributing eternity to Himself, it has not reference to his being eternal with respect to time (all notion of time by successive portions of duration being excluded from God's state of being), but to his being unchangeably gracious, merciful, and long-suffering.

He is not everlasting, nor is He immortal, any further than that his being includes these conditions; for things that last for ever must have both a past

and a future, and immortality presupposes a liability to death. But his eternity connected with his name is for an assurance that his creatures can never be in any phase of existence, temporal or everlasting, in which they will find Him other than gracious, merciful, and long-suffering.

The Apostle's dictum, that *all Scripture is profitable*, is a warning to us not to make revelation a foundation for unprofitable speculations. The nature of the Almighty is disclosed to us in Scripture as including perfections which are profitable to us, as containing the substance of all that is excellent in man. The Gospel revelation adds to this knowledge the method of attaining to perfection. Speculations on the Almighty as being Unconditioned and Absolute are outside Scripture.

A small portion only of the intellect exercised in attempting to stretch the understanding till it is commensurate with the system of salvation, if spent on bringing back the disjointed matters in the Jewish Scriptures, would have made those Scriptures less suggestive of perplexities and more profitable to men.

Such a work is not advocated as capable of clear-

ing Scripture of mysteries. On the contrary, it must be expected that the clearer the sense and the more orderly the diction, the more apparent will mysteries be : as the clearer the sky, and the less the view is obstructed, the greater is the number of unapproachable stars visible.

Interpretation detects mysteries, as when our Lord took up the text, *the God of Abraham, of Isaac, and of Jacob* ; there was no mystery discernible in it ; it was excellently understood, though understood to mean only that the true God was the God whom those patriarchs worshipped. But our Lord, with the Spirit, blew aside a cloud, and the unsuspected mystery of the resurrection appeared where those words stood in the Scripture. Interpretation thus opened up a mystery ; it added much to man's understanding of the text, but it still left inexplicable " the raising of the dead to life again," which the understanding, incapable of explaining it, hands over as a mystery to faith to receive. There is everywhere in revealed truth an essential part which the intellect cannot analyze.

The Spirit leads the mind forwards through spaces of revealed matter intelligible to it, until at last the

intellect finds itself arrived at the boundary precipice, as it were, from the edge of which it looks out, incapable of proceeding further, into heights and depths. We are none the worse for not being able to proceed. All the accumulated and true knowledge that science has given us concerning the stars has not added one ray of light to what is received by men who have no science. And all the speculations of intellect on the invisible world have not added a moment's peace to the heart of man. The imagination is a blossom which perfects no fruit.



## XX.

The understanding mind and the believing spirit.

To have acquaintance, and hold communion, with God is a want felt in man. To satisfy this craving, man's understanding, as the readiest and most confident part of man, would fain go forth and feel after God; but though it may proceed far in exploring the reasons and the methods of the righteousness and judgment on which his power is seated and established, the understanding, in its progress onwards and upwards, comes in time to the clouds and darkness that are round about God, a darkness which can be felt by the mental power, shutting out the understanding from apprehending the Almighty.

So the understanding returns from searching after the Almighty, not having found Him; yet is the man as certainly convinced of the existence of God as before he was baffled in reaching Him. He finds

himself more competent to believe than to understand, and feels that the difficulty of comprehending is no obstacle to believing. It is not because things are hard to explain that they are hard to believe.

It may then be asked whether man, in directing his understanding to receive the knowledge of God, or any spiritual knowledge, is employing the faculty suited to its reception. We know that if we would receive light we must direct the eye to the source of light, the ear is useless for the purpose; and so perhaps the understanding is not the faculty which receives from God the knowledge of his existence, his infinity, his eternity, his omnipresence, and his omnipotence. When the Almighty enunciated his name, He did not enumerate these his perfections, because there is nothing in them that can be imitated by being put into practice by man. But they are all abundantly asserted in Scripture, and are profitable to be known, because powerful in moulding the hidden conscientious life of thought, as his other perfections are in directing and controlling the outward life of actions. If there is any such faculty in man which can receive the knowledge of God, it must be a faculty higher than the understanding.

Now, that power which can arraign and call another to account is higher than a faculty which is responsible to it ; and we know that the understanding is often called to account for evil thoughts by a faculty in man which he names *conscience*, which itself is never called to account by the understanding ; the understanding acquiescing without appeal, and submitting when conscience condemns the man. The conscience judges all other faculties in man, and is judged by none of them ; in this it is more god-like than the understanding, and therefore the more likely to be the recipient of divine things.

God made man in the image of God ; no one knows what God is but God Himself ; no one knows what the man is but the man himself (1 Cor. ii. 11).

Our conscience knows what we are. The conscience has the image of a perpetual I AM in it. The presence of things in the memory is always accompanied by a note of time past ; but the consciousness of good done is in the conscience always a reward, absolutely of the present ; the time elapsed since it was done does not affect the conscience.

The image of God in man is, in man's spirit, such an impression of likeness as spirit can receive from

spirit. We find in the conscience more note of this likeness than in the understanding. The understanding is served by many senses, and has many faculties ; the conscience is served by only one sense, which we may call *instinct*, which has no faculties but those of receiving and retaining. It cannot venture forth, like the understanding, to seek after God, but God reveals Himself to it ; it cannot throw light on the existence of God, but God causes the light of his face to shine on it.

Every communication from man to man passes into the understanding through the senses ; but the Almighty *passes by* the understanding and the senses, and shines into the Spirit.

If the existence and position of the sun in space could be deduced only from the perpetual gravitation of the earth and planets to a centre of power (that is, supposing the sun invisible), then our knowledge of the existence of the sun would be a question of more or less probability, and a matter for investigation among civilised and educated nations. Men uncivilised would never suspect it. It would be, not knowledge, but a curious inquiry like that instituted concerning the existence of some

large invisible bodies in space, which has been suspected from the observation of motion in the stars, and has been felt after.

But the faintest impression of the sun's outline on the eye of the least educated man, be it only for a moment, is sufficient to put its existence out of question and beyond doubt.

Similarly, if the existence, eternity, and infinity of the Almighty are matters to be suspected from the effects of a Providence pervading the circumstances and conditions of created things, or to be reasoned out from probabilities; that is to say, if it were given and left to the understanding by its mental faculties to ascertain the existence of the Almighty, it would be unsuspected by savage nations, and would be a matter of only more or less certainty to civilised men; but uneducated nations have it.

But if there is in man's spirit a sense or faculty which can receive the impression of God without referring to the mental powers for evidence of the certainty of the knowledge imparted (as the eye receives light without any exercise of judgment), we can understand how a knowledge of God, common



to the savage and to the educated man, is independent of the development of the mental powers ; for it enters not through them, or by them, but by an inlet which God has so constituted in all men, that it admits with certainty that knowledge which it is indispensable for man to apprehend ; otherwise, he would be an animal. And for want of a better term we may call this part of man, *Instinct*, the instinct of the Spirit that is in man.

This instinct in man is the stronghold of natural, and the vessel of revealed, religion. The discerning of right from wrong, and the dictates of conscience, are of it ; as the acquiescence in good or in evil and private judgment are of the mind. As regards truth, 'it is to the intellect as the Creed is to theology ; and as regards convictions, as the martyr to the mere professor. He who would paralyse it in himself must sear it first with a hot iron (1 Tim. iv. 2). It despotically imposes on the man an unchangeable personal identity, commanding the concurrence of the mind which acquiesces in the mystery (though it cannot explain it), because it cannot controvert it by suggesting an alternative. But for this instinct and its dictates, the mind,

by casuistry, would have expunged honesty from religion, and, by private judgment, inspiration from Scripture. The mind in man having been corrupted, the instinct merely debilitated, by his fall.

It was the understanding that asked, "Is not this the carpenter?" and that said, "This is a hard saying, who can receive it?" It is the instinct that answers, "Here am I" to the voice that speaks to it; it was the instinct that said, "Speak, Lord, for thy servant heareth." When the angel had spoken to Zacharias things that required the instinctive assent of the Spirit, and he summoned the understanding to discuss the probability of the event foretold, asking, "How shall I know this?" he was struck dumb; silence was imposed on his understanding, that his spirit might imbibe in stillness.

It is not meant that the instinct can say to the understanding, "I have no need of thee," but that the understanding ought to discern the instinct and its peculiar gift; the dignity and usefulness of the understanding in admiring the methods and discerning the ways of God's providence need not be

enlarged on. Many of the things of God are adapted to the faculties of the understanding, such are the holiness and reasonableness of God's laws and commandments. Those things which the Almighty has communicated to man in dreams, have been revealed to his understanding; they have not been matters of faith, but matters for the reason to judge of, such as indications of events about to happen, or directions for his guidance.

And though there be not the image of God in man's understanding mind, there is in it a moral sense, the same in all men, the peculiar treasure of the understanding, which He has lodged in it, which has also its manner of knowing God, a knowledge which consists in knowing what is due to a Supreme Being.

And it may be observed that the knowledge of God is not the only knowledge in man which is independent of his mental powers, either as regards its origin or its proof: nor the only thing that man can only hold and believe, but cannot doubt of: the knowledge of his personal identity, that he is now the individual that he was at his birth, and will be at his resurrection, and not another, neither admits

of proof, nor requires it, from the senses. It is of the instinct, not of the mind.

The term instinct suggests to us the animals, in which instinct is most apparent, since they exhibit it continually and prominently, the understanding in them being, in wild animals undeveloped, and in domesticated animals very trivial. Whereas, in man, instinct is very inconspicuous, being overshadowed by the understanding, which is wide, active, and incessantly growing as his wants and his ambition grow. As things earthly and visible are more in the minds of men than things spiritual and invisible, so the understanding, which entertains things temporal, is more in man than the instinct, the inlet of spiritual things only.

Man has all the senses found in animals, and though in addition he has an intellect above that of animals, yet if man has not instinct also, he is so far deficient in a quality which the animals have, for which understanding is not an adequate substitute, and, so far, inferior to them.

This quality, instinct, is more accurate and exact than understanding, though far more limited than it; this is so because it has a singleness of purpose,

that purpose being of the highest possible value : instinct being concerned solely with the highest possible good of which the creature is capable.

Instinct is more accurate and exact than understanding. It is incapable of wavering ; its methods have the certainty of assurance, its beginning being in certainty.

But understanding is essentially dubious ; it proceeds from a great failure to a less, in quest of perfection ; from uncertainty to probability in quest of assurance.

Instinct has a singleness of purpose—it impels the creature to its indispensable and highest good. In animals it is an unerring guide to temporal preservation, their highest good, the spirit in them being capable of only temporal aspirations. The evils that befall animals are never attributable to their instinct. God being the only Being and Power who is the author and promoter of good exclusively, instinct therefore seems most simply accounted as being the word of God to the creature, and the creature's obedience to it. The Spirit communicating with such spirit as He has given to any of the creatures of his hand.



Scripture does not hesitate to speak of such communications. The Lord *commanded* the ravens to feed Elijah. God *spoke* to the fish which had swallowed Jonah. That which apprehends God is the instinct in the immaterial part of the animal. "Ye are of more value than many sparrows," our Lord said to men.

Man being designed for higher purposes, and capable of higher good than the animals, we must pause before we believe that the Creator gave the animal a quality which receives his communications without the ability to doubt or misinterpret Him; and gave man no such quality, but only understanding, a faculty, the very use of which implies a doubt in him who uses it.

But if we assign instinct in man as the recipient of the manifestations which the Spirit makes concerning God to the man, we justify the ways of the Almighty, who, such being the case, imparts that which must not be doubted of, to a faculty in man unable to doubt; and declares things inexplicable by man to that, in man, which knows not what explanation may be.

For so is instinct: it receives with marvellous

aptitude and holds with extreme tenacity ; it is the purveyor to the conscience of things of which the conscience takes cognisance.

Spiritual knowledge is not, first, in the understanding, and then, through it, in the conscience : but it is received by the instinct, which discerns things invisible, and apprehends things inexplicable. As we see in ourselves that no false assertion, but only that which is true, moves the conscience, and that instinctively (our conscience never making a false charge against us), so matters of revelation intimate their own truth and reality by having the peculiarity of impressing the instinct, and are matters of conscience.

Conscience is to man the evidence of his spirit and of its instinct, as the understanding is to him evidence of the possession of mind and senses. Things unseen, things eternal and spiritual, give evidence of their truth and existence to this instinct, and being received are faith, by which we are saved. Things seen, temporal and intellectual, give evidence concerning themselves to the understanding, and being assented to are beliefs, by which we learn to say, " Lord," " Lord," in vain.

Man's salvation depending on truths, which he cannot, by all men's consent, understand, would be impracticable if he had only the understanding to receive them by: they require for their reception a quality different from the understanding. To it God is omnipresent, infinite, eternal; such things the instinct receives and holds; the conscience assenting, while the understanding stands amazed at finding in man knowledge and faith which it has had no part in producing, and has no capability of explaining.

Thus it is that the limits of thought are not the boundaries of knowledge in man: as the surface of the earth, even on its highest hills, is not the boundary of the globe, for there is still an atmosphere beyond, pervious to light and created to receive it, so there is an instinct beyond the understanding fitted to receive the Spirit, and pervious to it.

It is therefore not by the prehensile power of thought that the things of God are apprehended by the inner man, but by the shining into the heart of the true light from God.

All words are sounds and meanings, the words of Christ are besides Spirit and Life.

“It is the Spirit that quickeneth, the flesh profiteth nothing.” By the flesh, our Lord meant something mortal ; by the Spirit, the immortal Spirit in man. The mind, though not material, is still flesh ; being mortal, it is part of the outer man ; for intellectual energy ceases when muscular activity does at death. The flesh profiteth nothing ; the mind is not the agent in discerning the spiritual, nor the vessel that receives the vital.

When our Lord set Himself to prove to his disciples that that which entereth by the mouth cannot operate to defile a man, he appealed to their understanding to justify his assertion ; He said, “Do ye not understand ?” for the question was within the jurisdiction of reason.

When our Lord had said, “Whoso eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood hath eternal life,” He said to his hearers, “There are some of you that *believe* not.” He did not complain of their not understanding, for He had not been appealing to their understanding, which can be instructed by man, but He had been speaking to the instinct of the Spirit in man, which can be taught only by God.

He had been speaking to them of bread for the Spirit of man; some could apprehend nothing in what He said, but words concerning food that entereth into man's mouth. According to this, their understanding, they were right in asking, "How can this *man* give us his flesh to eat?" Our Lord in return made no attempt to explain, but uttered the solemn "Amen," "Amen," the watchword of him who standeth at the door and knocks, to whom the instinct opens.

The instinct of the Spirit is the child of promise; but the understanding of the mind is born after the flesh.

The Lord loves the instinct more than He loves the intellect, as He loved Jacob more than Esau; and to the instinct, as to Jacob, spiritual ministers come; and to it the Lord makes Himself known, and gives his promise. For it is the part in man which alone is capable of admitting the real presence, as distinguished from the unreal idea, or mental conception, of the Lord, when He fulfils his promise of offering to make his abode, *μόνην*, with man, as an inmate of his creatures (John xvi. 23).

The Gospel propounds spiritual mysteries; it is



superstition which devises subsidiary intellectual mysteries. Men are never shaken in their faith so long as avouched mysteries are set before them ; it is when a mystery, diluted with an evasion or an explanation, is propounded to them, that doubts suggest themselves to men. If only the bare mysteries of the Gospel had been preached to nations without the added subtleties of the schoolmen, Christendom would not have swarmed with disbelievers as it does.

He who calls himself a Rationalist has given a sensual preference to the intellect, because it satisfies him to fulness with the fruits of the imagination, as Isaac preferred Esau to Jacob, because he provided him with savoury meat such as his soul loved.

In the sceptic, the understanding, jealous of the secrets of the instinct, which can neither be explained by the intellect, nor overlooked, nor denied by it, first mocks at the privileged possessor of a knowledge which it neither values nor comprehends, as Ishmael mocked at Isaac ; and then goes forth into the dry places of disbelief, as Ishmael into the waterless desert of Paran.

In the infidel, the intellect has risen up against

the instinct and has taken away its life, as Cain rose up against Abel and slew him ; and, like Cain, has departed from the presence of the Lord into a land in which the fear of God and moral restraints are unrecognised.

## PRINCIPAL TEXTS ILLUSTRATED.

---

	PAGE
Bind up the law, seal the prophecy . . . . .	9
In all my epistles, so I write . . . . .	10
This treasure we have in earthen vessels . . . . .	11
She dwelt in the College at Jerusalem . . . . .	17
The proverbs of the ancients . . . . .	59
Thou hast increased the nation . . . . .	70
Then went Moses up . . . . .	71
I spake not unto your fathers concerning burnt offerings . . . . .	74
Put your burnt offerings unto your peace offerings . . . . .	75
Judah was His sanctuary . . . . .	77
Until Shiloh comes . . . . .	78
Thou shalt write all the words of this law . . . . .	86
None other gods before Me . . . . .	88
Visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children . . . . .	117
Hate God—love Him—know Him . . . . .	117
I will curse them that curse thee . . . . .	128
Behold a virgin shall conceive . . . . .	132
The Lord of Hosts . . . . .	137
The children of Israel went up harnessed . . . . .	138
Ye shall be as gods, knowing good and evil . . . . .	140
Like one of us, to know good and evil . . . . .	141
Butter and honey shall he eat . . . . .	147
He that hath not, from him shall be taken away even that he hath . . . . .	165
The ox knoweth his owner . . . . .	168

	PAGE
Behemoth and beasts of the field . . . . .	170
God created the heavens and the earth . . . . .	179
Behold it was very good . . . . .	179
He called them gods to whom the word of God came . . .	181
The curse hath devoured the earth . . . . .	181
I have created him, I have formed him, yea, I have made him	191
Any one that findeth me shall slay me . . . . .	193
The Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground . .	195
Noah was perfect in his generations . . . . .	196
The voice of the Lord God walking in the garden . . .	200
The presence of the Lord . . . . .	200
I gave them also statutes that were not good . . . . .	228
The great temptations which thine eyes saw . . . . .	231
They drank of that spiritual rock that followed them . .	233
A mixed multitude went up . . . . .	234
The people shall not be reckoned among the nations . .	241
I will deliver the inhabitants of the land into thine hand .	249
I will destroy all the people . . . . .	249
Thou shalt smite them and utterly destroy them . . . .	251
None devoted that shall be devoted of men shall be redeemed, but shall be put to death . . . . .	253
Made a curse for us . . . . .	255
Cursed is everyone that hangeth on a tree . . . . .	255
Thou shalt, in any wise, bury him that day . . . . .	256
The first born of thy sons shalt thou give unto me. . .	260
Nor show mercy unto them . . . . .	263
I will cut them off. . . . .	264
The Lord said unto Joshua . . . . .	268
God said—the Lord God said—God spake, saying . . .	270
The Lord said unto my Lord . . . . .	272
Verily I say unto you . . . . .	272
The Lord revealed himself to Samuel . . . . .	278
Let thy Urim and thy Thummim be with thy Holy One .	281
No open vision . . . . .	293
A great mystery . . . . .	312
Philosophy and vain deceit . . . . .	314
The oracles of God . . . . .	324

	PAGE
The Sabbath drew on . . . . .	333
Your heave offering shall be reckoned unto you, &c. . . . .	334
The way to the holiest of all was not yet made manifest . . . . .	342
They have seen thy going, O God, in the sanctuary . . . . .	351
Let my prayer be set before thee as incense . . . . .	354
I will not smell in your solemn assemblies . . . . .	354
That he might add it to the prayers of the saints . . . . .	359
Thou shalt sacrifice the Passover unto the Lord thy God, of the flock and of the herd . . . . .	363
Supper being ended . . . . .	364
Because of the Jew's preparation day . . . . .	367
The Canaanite in the house of the Lord . . . . .	374
One mediator between God and man, the man Christ Jesus . . . . .	377
In that day ye shall ask me nothing . . . . .	378
A more sure word of prophecy . . . . .	380
Is not of any private interpretation . . . . .	380
I will give them a heart of flesh . . . . .	383
The answer of a good conscience towards God . . . . .	384
Whatsoever ye shall ask the Father, &c. . . . .	388
Baptized into the name of the Lord . . . . .	395
Thy name is as ointment poured out . . . . .	399

THE END.





Works by the Rev. E. H. Plumptre, M.A.

RECTOR OF PLUCKLEY, AND PROFESSOR OF DIVINITY, KING'S COLLEGE, LONDON.

---

## Biblical Studies. .

Post 8vo, 7s. 6d.

## The Tragedies of Æschylos.

A New Translation, with a Biographical Essay, and  
an Appendix of Rhymed Choruses. Two vols.  
post 8vo, 12s.

## The Tragedies of Sophocles.

A New Translation, with a Biographical Essay, and  
an Appendix of Rhymed Choruses. Crown 8vo,  
7s. 6d.

## Lazarus, and other Poems.

Crown 8vo, 5s.

## Master and Scholar, and other

Poems. Crown 8vo, 5s.

## Theology and Life.

Small 8vo, 6s.

## Christ and Christendom :

Being the Boyle Lectures for 1866. Demy 8vo, 12s.

## Sunday.

8vo, sewed, 6d.

---

STRAHAN & CO., 56, LUDGATE HILL, LONDON.

Works by C. J. Vaughan, D.D.

MASTER OF THE TEMPLE.

---

Family Prayers.

Crown 8vo, 3s. 6d.

The Presence of God in his Temple. Small 8vo, 3s. 6d.

Sundays in the Temple.

Small 8vo, 3s. 6d.

Half-hours in the Temple Church.

Small 8vo, 3s. 6d.

Last Words in the Parish Church of Doncaster. Crown 8vo, 3s. 6d.

Earnest Words for Earnest Men.

Small 8vo, 3s. 6d.

Characteristics of Christ's Teaching. Small 8vo, 2s. 6d.

Christ the Light of the World.

Small 8vo, 2s. 6d.

Plain Words on Christian Living.

Small 8vo, 2s. 6d.

Voices of the Prophets on Faith, Prayer, and Human Life. Small 8vo, 2s. 6d.

---

STRAHAN & CO., 56, LUDGATE HILL, LONDON.

## Works by Henry Alford, D.D.

THE LATE DEAN OF CANTERBURY.

---

The Book of Genesis and part of  
the Book of Exodus. A Revised Version with Mar-  
ginal References, and an Explanatory Commen-  
tary. Demy 8vo, 12s.

### The New Testament.

Authorised Version Revised. 6s., 3s. 6d., 1s. 6d.

### Essays and Addresses,

Chiefly on Church Subjects. Demy 8vo, 7s. 6d.

### The Year of Prayer :

Being Family Prayers for the Christian Year. Crown  
8vo, 3s. 6d. ; 12mo, 1s. 6d.

### The Week of Prayer :

An abridgment of "The Year of Prayer," intended for  
use in Schools. Neat cloth, 9d.

### The Year of Praise :

Being Hymns with Tunes, for the Sundays and Holi-  
days of the Year. 3s. 6d., 1s. 6d., 1s., 6d.

How to Study the New Testa-  
ment. In Three Parts. Small 8vo, 3s. 6d. each.

Part I.—The Gospels and the Acts of the Apostles. Part II.  
—The Epistles (Section I.). Part III.—The Epistles (Sec-  
tion II.) and the Apocalypse.

### Eastertide Sermons.

Preached before the University of Cambridge. Small  
8vo, 3s. 6d.

### Meditations :

Advent, Creation, Providence. Small 8vo, 3s. 6d.

---

STRAHAN & CO., 56, LUDGATE HILL, LONDON.

Works by Horace Bushnell, D.D.

---

The Vicarious Sacrifice, grounded  
on Principles of Universal Obligation. Crown 8vo,  
7s. 6d.

Nature and the Supernatural, as  
Together constituting the One System of God.  
Crown 8vo, 3s. 6d.

Moral Uses of Dark Things.  
Crown 8vo, 6s.

Christ and His Salvation,  
in Sermons variously related thereto. Crown 8vo,  
4s. 6d.

The New Life.  
Crown 8vo, 3s. 6d.

Christian Nurture; or the Godly  
Up-bringing of Children. Crown 8vo, 3s. 6d.

Work and Play.  
Crown 8vo, 3s. 6d.

The Character of Jesus.  
Limp cloth, 6d.

---

STRAHAN & CO., 56, LUDGATE HILL, LONDON.



## Thoughts on Recent Scientific

Conclusions and their Relation to Religion. Crown  
8vo, 5s.

## The Ecclesiastical Polity of the

New Testament. A Study for the present Crisis in  
the Church of England. By the Rev. G. A.  
JACOB, D.D., late Head Master of Christ's Hos-  
pital. Post 8vo, 16s.

## History of Religious Thought in

England, from the Reformation to the end of the last  
Century. By the Rev. JOHN HUNT, Author of  
"An Essay on Pantheism." Vols. I and II.  
Demy 8vo, 21s. each.

## Heroes of Hebrew History.

By SAMUEL WILBERFORCE, D.D., Bishop of Win-  
chester. Crown 8vo, 5s.

## Music and Morals.

By the Rev. H. R. HAWEIS. Post 8vo, 12s.

## Essays, Theological and Literary.

By R. H. HUTTON. 2 vols., post 8vo, 24s.

## The Companions of St. Paul.

By J. S. HOWSON, D.D., Dean of Chester. Crown 8vo,  
5s.

## The Christian Doctrine of Prayer

for the Departed. With Copious Notes and Appendices. By the Rev. FREDERICK GEORGE LEE, D.C.L., Vicar of All Saints, Lambeth. Demy 8vo, 16s.

## Reasons for Returning to the

Church of England. By the Rev. J. M. CAPES. Second Edition. Crown 8vo, 5s.

## Religious Life in Germany during

the Wars of Independence, in a series of Biographical and Historical Sketches. By WILLIAM BAUR. Popular Edition, in one volume. Crown 8vo, 7s. 6d.

## Colloquia Crucis.

By DORA GREENWELL. Small 8vo, 3s. 6d.

## Scripture Portraits, and other

Miscellanies. By A. P. STANLEY, D.D., Dean of Westminster. Crown 8vo, 6s.

## The Presence of Christ.

By the Rev. A. W. THOROLD, Vicar of St. Pancras. Crown 8vo, 3s. 6d.

## The Metaphors of St. Paul.

By J. S. HOWSON, D.D., Dean of Chester. Crown 8vo, 3s. 6d.

---









UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS-URBANA



3 0112 108177715